DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 291 820 UD 026 013

AUTHOR Bossone, Richard M., Ed.; Polishook, Irwin H., Ed.
TITLE Restructuring the Schools. Proceedings: Conference of the University/Urban Schools National Task Force (9th, Nashville, Tennessee, November 6-7, 1987).
INSTITUTION City Univ. of New York, N.Y. Graduate School and Univ. Center.
PUB DATE 88
NOTE 111p.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cooperative Programs; *Curriculum; Dropout Prevention; *Educational Change; *Educational Responsibility; *Educational Strategies; Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Leadership; Program Development; Program Implementation; *School Effectiveness; Urban Education

ABSTRACT

These proceedings from a conference on restructuring the schools present a variety of perspectives for instituting educational change. Consideration of the theme allowed a review of the failures of educational reform, and a survey of current trends. There was a call for less rhetoric and more attention to comprehensive insights and plans that will bring about the needed change. The papers and authors are the following: (1) "Children Are Our Best Investment" (Owen Butler); (2) "Urban Education and the Nation's Future" (Ernest Boyer); (3) "Leadership for School Restructuring" (Frank Newman); (4) "Restructuring the Education System: Agenda for the 90's" (Michael Cohen); (5) "Restructuring the Schools: A Plan for New York City" (Leon Goldstein); (6) "The Detroit Dropout Prevention Collaborative" (Arthur Jefferson); (7) "The Memphis Dropout Prevention Collaborative" (Willie Herenton); (8) "Restructuring the Curriculum" (Diane Berreth); (9) "Restructuring Schools" (Holly Houston); (10) "The Cooperative Elementary School" (Robert Slavin); (11) "A Strategy for Restructuring Schools: School Renewal" (Paul Heckman); (12) "The Potential of Teacher Professionalism: Conditions and Implications" (Judy Johnston); (13) "Restructuring Schools To Facilitate Teacher Learning" (Willis Hawley); and (14) "Summation" (Sol Hurwitz). (VM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

2-23-88 UD

ED291820

PROCEEDINGS:

The Ninth Conference of the
University / Urban Schools National Task Force

Restructuring the Schools

Edited by Richard M. Bossone
and Irwin H. Polishook

The Graduate School and University Center
of The City University of New York

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Richard M. Bossone
City Univ. of New York

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

UD026013

PROCEEDINGS:

The Ninth Conference of the
University / Urban Schools National Task Force

Restructuring the Schools

November 6 and 7, 1987
Nashville

Edited by Richard M. Bossone
and Irwin H. Polishook

The Graduate School and University Center
of The City University of New York

1988

In memory of

COLONEL C. MIKE GILROD

outstanding supporter
of this Task Force
and distinguished publisher

PREFACE

Restructuring American public schools has taken on the dimension of an educational reform symbol. It serves to invite almost ritualistic commitments to the principle of reform without adequately defining the contours of change. Does restructuring mean a drastic reform of schooling? How will it effect the scale and character of existing educational units? Will a restructured school also be a place where the status of teachers has been altered? In what manner must the management of public school systems be redesigned? Is there a need for new instructural methods and curricula to accompany and promote the restructured institution? These and other related questions simply describe some boundaries of inquiry for a concept that is still too much a catchword rather than a governing reality.

Each participant in this conference on "Restructuring the Schools" was asked to respond to the subject from different perspectives of commitment and educational responsibility. No directions were needed to prompt one speaker's message that school success begins with people whose earliest family experience may predict their educational attainments. Nor were the conference participants surprised to hear a sensitive presentation that stressed the relevance of a "connection" between social pathology and the quality of schooling, even in a so-called "restructured" institution. Equally forceful were varied papers that stressed the particularity of change that involves curriculum design, foundation programs, cooperative learning, and teacher renewal as essential prescriptions on the road to reform. As an aggregate the conference's essential messsage was the need to tone down the

rhetoric of educational change in order to achieve the reality of educational reform. The theme of restructuring the schools served to review the failures of some current trends and those diverse programs and concepts presented as guideposts to future progress.

We believe the problem of retructuring the schools may be one of perspective. Each vision of relevant change, whatever point of view or source, demonstrates that no one experience will dominate the ongoing debate about effective reform; rather one needs a more comprehensive picture of the problem. The editors trust that every reader of these Proceedings will gain such insight into the complex agenda which "restructuring" entails.

R.M.B.
I.H.P.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
PREFACE		ii
PARTICIPANTS		vi
PERSPECTIVES ON RESTRUCTURING THE SCHOOLS		
BUSINESSMAN:	Children Are Our Best Investment Owen Bradford Butler	1
FOUNDATION PRESIDENT:	Urban Education and the Nation's Future Ernest L. Boyer	6
EDUCATION COMMISSION PRESIDENT:	Leadership for School Restructuring Frank Newman	12
GOVERNMENTAL SPOKESMAN:	Restructuring the Education System: Agenda for the 90's Michael Cohen	17
COLLEGE PRESIDENT:	Restructuring the Schools: A Plan for New York City Leon M. Goldstein	26
SUPERINTENDENTS:	The Detroit Dropout Prevention Collaborative Arthur Jefferson	32
	The Memphis Dropout Prevention Collaborative Willie W. Herenton	45
CURRICULUM DIRECTOR:	Restructuring the Curriculum Diane G. Berreth	50
PROJECT DIRECTOR:	Restructuring Schools Holly M. Houston	55

Page

PROFESSORS: The Cooperative Elementary School
Robert E. Slavin 59

A Strategy for Restructuring Schools: School Renewal
Paul E. Heckman 68

PROGRAM DIRECTOR: The Potential of Teacher Professionalism: Conditions and Implications
Judy A. Johnston 76

DEAN OF TEACHER EDUCATION: Restructuring Schools to Facilitate Teacher Learning
Willis D. Hawley 84

SUMMATION
Sol Hurwitz 91

NINTH CONFERENCE OF THE UNIVERSITY/URBAN SCHOOLS NATIONAL TASK FORCE

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Chairman

Dr. Richard M. Bossone
University Dean for Instructional Research
Graduate School and University Center
City University of New York

Co-Chairman

Mr. Fred H. Hechinger
President
New York Times Foundation, Inc.

Secretary

Dr. Max Weiner
Dean
Graduate School of Education
Fordham University at Lincoln Center

Participants

Dr. Jack Allen
Professor of History, Emeritus
Peabody College at Vanderbilt University

Dr. Diane G. Berreth
Director of Field Services
Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

Dr. Ernest L. Boyer
President
The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

Dr. Elbert D. Brooks
Executive Secretary
Tennessee Organization of School Superintendents

Mr. Owen Bradford Butler
Retired Chairman of the Board
The Procter & Gamble Company

Ms. Happie Byers
Former Director and Senior Faculty
Bank Street College of Education

Mr. Thomas G. Caulkins
Director, Student Assignment Services
Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools

Dr. Carol B. Choye
Superintendent
Princeton Regional Schools

Mr. William J. Cirone
County Superintendent
Santa Barbara County Schools

Dr. Richard W. Clark
Deputy Superintendent
Bellevue Public Schools

Mr. Michael Cohen
Associate Director of Educational Programs
National Governors' Association

Mr. Dan Covington
Director, Vocational Education
Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools

The Honorble Edith B. Everett
Vice Chairperson, Board of Trustees
City University of New York

Mr. Henry J. Everett
President
Lexington Associates

Dr. Roger B. Fransecky
President
CEL Educational Resources

Mr. Charles O. Frazier
Director of Schools
Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools

Ms. Joanne Gateley
President
Tennessee Association of School Supervision and Administration

Mr. Leon M. Goldstein
President
Kingsborough Community College
City University of New York

Mr. J. Weldon Greene
Director, Division of Program Development and Planning
District of Columbia Public Schools

Dr. Charlene Griffin
Associate Superintendent
Division of School Management
Baltimore Public Schools

Professor Tokio Hamana
Hyogo University
Yashiro, Japan

Dr. Peggy Harris
Research Assistant, Department of Research and Evaluation
Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools

Dr. Willis D. Hawley
Dean, Peabody College
Vanderbilt University

Dr. Paul E. Heckman
Assistant Dean, College of Education
University of Arizona

Dr. Willie W. Herenton
Superintendent
Memphis Public Schools

Ms. Holly M. Houston
Executive Director
Coalition of Essential Schools
Brown University

Ms. Nina Hurwitz
History Teacher
Mamaroneck Public Schools

Mr. Sol Hurwitz
Senior Vice President
Committee for Economic Development

Ms. Elizabeth Jackson
Director of Middle Schools
Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools

Dr. Arthur Jefferson
Superintendent
Detroit Public Schools

Dr. Judy A. Johnston
Director
Schenley High School Teacher Center

Mr. Michael J. Jordan
Director of Elementary Schools
Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools

Mr. Jack Kosiorek
Staff Manager
AT&T Educational Systems

Dr. Ronald Lewis
Coordinator of Social Work and Attendance
Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools

Professor Ryuso Matsubara
Hyogo University
Yashiro, Japan

The Honorable Ned McWherter
Governor
State of Tennessee

Dr. Edward J. Meade, Jr.
Chief Program Officer/Education
Urban Poverty Program, The Ford Foundation

Mr. Estel Mills
Assistant Commissioner for Curriculum and Instruction
State of Tennessee

Dr. Frank Newman
President
Education Commission of the States

Mr. Kenneth E. Nye
Executive Administrative Assistant and Research Associate
Tennessee Board of Education

Professor Yoshitomi Okazaki
Hyogo University
Yashiro, Japan

Ms. Margaret M. O'Shaughnessy
Curriculum Director
Minneapolis Public Schools

Mrs. Bertha O. Pendleton
Duputy Superintendent
San Diego Unified School District

Dr. Irwin H. Polishook
President
Professional Staff Congress
City University of New York

Ms. Etta W. Proshansky
Director, Early Childhood Education and Staff Development
District 3, New York City Public Schools

Dr. Harold M. Proshansky
President
Graduate School and University Center
City University of New York

Dr. Paul Regnier
Special Assistant to Assistant Superintendent
Staff Development, Planning, and Evaluation
Fairfax County Public Schools

Dr. Eugene Reville
Associate Superintendent
Buffalo Public Schools

Mr. Edward Reynolds, Jr.
President
Innovative Sciences

Mr. Manuel Rivera
Deputy Superintendent of Schools for Operations
Rochester Public Schools

Ms. Mary DePiano Rothlein
Dean, John Jay College of Criminal Justice
City University of New York

Dr. Robert E. Slavin
Director, Elementary School Program
Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools
Johns Hopkins University

Dr. Charles E. Smith
Commissioner of Education
State of Tennessee

Dr. Dolphus Spence
Director of High Schools
Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools

Judge Paul Summers
Summerville
Tennessee

Mrs. Paul Summers
Summerville
Tennessee

Dr. Edward M. Taylor
Director of Business Services
Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools

Dr. Barbara Thomas
Coordinator of Psychological Services
Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools

Dr. Nancy Tirrill
Program Assistant, Federal Programs
Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools

Mrs. Eleanor S. Turner
Research Assisant, Graduate School
City University of New York

Ms. Betty Uhles
Program Assistant, Personnel Department
Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools

Mr. Larry Vick
Superintendent
Paris Special School District

Dr. Ronald E. Walton
Superintendent
Fayette County Public Schools

Dr. Y. Nona Weekes
Chair, Educational Leadership
Bank Street College of Education

Ms. Bonnie Wells
Director of Employee Relations
Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools

Dr. Bill M. Wise
Assistant Superintendent, Business and Facility Services
Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools

Dr. Aldorothy Wright
Director of Elementary Schools
Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools

Mr. John R. Younger
Assistant Superintendent, School Administrative Services
Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools

CHILDREN ARE OUR BEST INVESTMENT

Owen Bradford Butler
Retired Chairman of the Board
Procter & Gamble Company

The Board of Trustees of the Committee for Economic Development (CED) includes about 250 senior executives supported by a professional staff, and is advised by some of the nation's most respected citizens. The group does not represent any industry or even business generally in the normal sense of the word. Instead, it seeks to anticipate unusual economic opportunities or problems for our country as a whole and to find qualified individuals who would devote the time and energy necessary to study the issue and propose the program that will best serve our country.

The trustees of CED believe very deeply that American business and industry can prosper only if our society continues to be a peaceful, properous democracy.

In 1982, the CED launched a major effort on behalf of public education in the United States. The reason was simple. Our trustees believed that nothing will more surely affect the future productivity of our economy and the quality of the people who make up our businesses and our industries. If we are to recapture our position as the world leader in productivity and living standards, we must regain our position as the nation with the best and the most broadly educated population in the world.

I was privileged to chair CED's Subcommittee on Business and the Schools and to have as members not only a distinguished group of business people but an equally distinguished group of professionals in the field of

education. These people spent three years developing a set of 89 recommendations which any school district can use to prepare their children to lead more productive economic lives, to make their schools more accountable and productive, and to attract, retain, and get optimum contribution from a talented and dedicated teacher work force.

During the course of those studies, we found mounting evidence that the reform movements of recent years, while they are beginning to improve the effectiveness of our schools for many students, are simply not reaching the neediest students. That discovery led to the creation of a subcommittee to deal only with children who are deprived and disadvantaged during their early childhood. The policy statement, titled Children in Need, was published in September, 1987. The overriding conclusion of that report is that this nation cannot afford to defer making the investment in these children in order to prevent their later failure.

We have identified a whole series of programs dealing with issues all the way from prenatal care, to impoverished mothers, to job programs for disadvantaged high school students. We evaluated these programs from a purely economic standpoint, and we concluded that an adequate investment in the right kinds of programs for these disadvantaged children will, in fact, pay big profits to the taxpayer. The earlier in a child's life the investment is made, the more effective and the more efficient it will be.

But there is a more compelling reason to make this investment than simple economics and profitability. Our nation is defined by a vision of what a nation should be, a society in which all people can live together in peace, govern themselves, and offer every child born or brought into the society an equal opportunity to develop his or her talent to the optimum

and to enjoy the fruits of individual effort.

To me, this vision is best stated poetically in the verse of "America the Beautiful" which says, "Her alabaster cities gleam undimmed by human tears." That does not describe Watts very well, or Harlem, or parts of Baltimore and Cincinnati. It is a goal we have never reached, but it is a goal which every generation of Americans must strive to bring closer to reality, and the greatest barrier to the achievement of that goal today is not from foreign shores, but from poverty and ignorance.

Our current report has good news. After two years of study, we know how to conquer that ignorance and, through conquering ignorance, we can conquer poverty in just one generation. We can do that if we can ensure every child born in this country a reasonably healthy start, a normal birth weight, and sound parenting for the critical first five years of life.

If a child has no parents or has parents who are unable or unwilling to provide traditional nurture, then we must develop supplemental parenting in high quality infant/child care centers and in high quality preschool programs. It is only through that kind of intensive early involvement in the lives of these children that we can forestall the problems that plague us in teenage pregnancies, drugs, alcohol, crime, and dropouts.

It is very late. Twenty-five percent of our children under six are now living in poverty and, in many of our cities, the number is more like 50 percent. It is already too late to provide care before age six for any child who will graduate from high school in this century. We can remove much of the tax burden of welfare and prisons from our grandchildren and, beyond that, we can remove the despair and desperation from the lives of many of our children in need. We can move our nation closer to the

realization of our vision.

In stressing the necessity of early prevention, I do not mean to downplay the need to press ahead with education reform. In fact, the CED report warns that there is little sense in giving disadvantaged children a head start if the schools that await them fail to build on early successes and instead promote failure. The graduating class of the year 2000 started school this year, joining more than 10 million other disadvantaged children and teens already in school.

In Children in Need, we call for sweeping reform of the education system to make schools more responsive to the needs of the disadvantaged. We call for fundamental restructuring of the way schools are organized, managed, staffed, and financed. We support school-based management, greater decision-making ability for teachers with a demonstrated commitment to teaching the disadvantaged, smaller schools and smaller classes, and a variety of social support, health care, and extracurricular programs.

Do we see the federal role in all of this? We do not expect the federal government to shoulder the full burden of addressing the special needs of the disadvantaged. We see the federal role as one of leveraging resources and pointing the way for state and local governments, which, ultimately, have the responsibility for education. We also see an important role for the federal government in establishing pilot projects and providing the research that can track programs and evaluate progress.

We ask the federal government to reaffirm the long-standing commitment to ensuring that the disadvantaged have access to quality education. Without equity, excellence is impossible. We consider it essential that funding of Chapter I remedial reading and mathematics programs and Head Start is brought

up to levels sufficient to ensure that all eligible children are served. These programs have proven their ability to narrow the gap in achievement between disadvantaged and nondisadvantaged children.

Some of the changes CED advocates can be put in place now; others address fundamental, structural weaknesses in our public schools and in our policies toward children and youths. Making these longer-term changes will take a sustained effort and a firm commitment by a broad-based coalition of government, education, business, and community leaders.

It is very clear that the nation that dominates the world economy will be the nation that has the more broadly educated society. The strongest defense armada cannot protect a peaceful, prosperous democracy if we fail to develop our human resources. We know how to break the cycle of poverty. Failing to make the necessary investment to do that is economic foolishness and a crime against humanity.

URBAN EDUCATION AND THE NATION'S FUTURE

Ernest L. Boyer
President
The Carnegie Foundation for the
Advancement of Teaching

It has been four and one-half years since the National Commission on Excellence in Education declared: "If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war." Since that hyperbole hit the headlines, this nation has engaged in the most serious and sustained bipartisan drive for school renewal in our history. Thanks to governors, educators, and legislative leaders, including many assembled in this room, education has been at the top of the national agenda, and I applaud the remarkable progress that we have made.

Still, the report card is very mixed. The reforms seem to be working fairly in schools that are already stable and advantaged. What I worry about are the urban schools and schools that serve the rural poor. And I am convinced that if we do not find ways to develop a radical, new agenda for the least advantaged students, this reform movement will have failed at its most essential task. History will not look kindly on our efforts if, with all of our talk about renewal, we simply benefit the privileged.

During the last eight months, we at the Carnegie Foundation have been in six cities across the country looking at the schools. We asked: "Is the reform movement working in our inner cities?" My conclusion is that many urban schools are imperiled and that today's strategies for renewal simply

are not adequate to meet the problem. I recognize that there are no easy answers. If there were, we would have found them long ago. Still, I do have several priorities to propose that may serve as a framework for discussion.

First, poverty and education are inextricably connected, and there is no way to talk about urban education without confronting the problems of the poor. Frankly, I find it shocking that for the past decade this nation has not placed the highest national priority on confronting poverty among our children. Consider this: in 1985, the poverty rate was 20.5 percent, or one in five, for children under 18. The poverty rate for children under six was 23 percent.

Malnutrition affects almost a half-million children in this nation. The report of the Physicians Task Force on Hunger in America documented the issue. Mothers and babies who are nutritionally deprived will, in later years, be intellectually and academically deficient. If we do not understand the linkage between good nutrition and good schooling, we have failed to make a connection that is absolutely crucial.

If I had one recommendation for reform, I suggest that we start talking about nutrition. And a top priority must be full funding of federal child nutrition programs. Winston Churchill said on one occasion that "there is no finer investment for any community than putting milk into babies." This is a far higher priority than putting weapons systems into space.

Second, to be successful, urban schools must give priority to pre-school and early education. The first years are absolutely crucial. It is here that the foundation will be laid. I believe we can compensate for a poor beginning, but surely the task of education is far more difficult if the child has been educationally deprived in the early years of life.

I predict the time is not far off when pre-kindergarten programs will be available for three- and four-year olds, as the nation's governors recommended. Incidentally, the recent governors' report on education is both enlightened and creative. The document speaks in imaginative ways about pre-school education. Did you think you would see the day when governors would urge schools to enroll students who are three years old?

Missouri has launched a model program, one that provides parent education. To promote parent involvement in the schools, I suggest we also need a national policy to give parents time off from work occasionally to participate in the education of their children. After all, we give time off to vote and to serve on a jury; surely excellent education is a civic obligation, too.

Further, to strengthen the first years of school, I would like to see a non-graded unit--kindergarten through grade four--an arrangement in which children would not be moved along chronologically but would move primarily on the basis of their linguistic proficiency. The goal of this "Basic School" would be the language empowerment of each student.

The focus would be on language: the reading of stories, the telling of stories, and the writing of stories. There would be room for the arts as well. In the "Basic School," class size would be restricted. One cannot have urban classes of 20 or 30 children and expect a teacher to give personal attention to each student. So, if I had my way as "Secretary of School Reform," I would insist that there be no more than 15 students for every teacher.

Third, to improve urban education I am convinced the school calendar must be changed. The day is not far off when we will have to reorganize

both the school day and the school year in order to reflect changing work and family patterns in the nation. When the current school calendar was organized a hundred years ago, almost all families were living on farms. Children had the summer off to help tend the crops. We are now living with an obsolete school model that does not fit the reality of home or work life. Today, almost all families have parents who are working and many live in a single parent home.

I am suggesting that the school has both an educational and a custodial function to fulfill. And it seems absolutely clear that between now and the year 2000 we will have a radically reorganized school calendar, one that mirrors the realities of family life. Instead of nine months of classes and three months off, we might have shorter terms of three months and then a week to ten days off: a time for teacher renewal and teacher development.

I also see the urgent need to have afternoon enrichment programs in every school. This extended school arrangement should be available on a voluntary basis to all families where the child is not cared for after school. Such a program is an essential response to the latchkey problem or, stated more precisely, the "street drift problem" we have in urban communities today. We also need enrichment programs in the summer for children whose parents are not able to pay for such opportunities.

What I worry about is that affluent families will be able to pay for these services, while poor children are allowed to drift. To close the gap between the haves and have nots, I would argue strongly for a new chapter in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, one that would provide federal vouchers for every poor parent so they could secure afternoon enrichment and summer services for their children. Families who can afford it should pay

for the extra services so the program would be self-supporting. I am suggesting that we should start adjusting our public policies to accommodate the changing school and family patterns of the nation.

Fourth, there is the matter of school size. I am convinced that if urban schools are to succeed, we must break up large schools into smaller units. Some of the warehouses we call schools are frighteningly overcrowded, impersonal places; and if I were to choose one pathology that is at the heart of the dropout problem, it is the anonymity found in high school today. As students move into junior and senior high school, they become faceless and nameless at the very moment they need their identity established. Again, if I were "Secretary of School Reform," I would organize all urban schools into small academic villages and insist that every student be known and counseled by a mentor.

The fifth priority for urban schools is the cluster school arrangement, an educational program that combines service, work, and learning. It is shocking that seventeen- and eighteen-year olds are still being confined to schools, moving in rigid lockstep from eight o'clock to three o'clock, just as they did when they were four and five years old. What we need is a far more flexible relationships between schooling and the world outside.

Specifically, I would like to see the last two years of high school converted into what might be called a "transition school": an arrangement in which students spend part time in school, perhaps part time in work, and part time in service. Some might even spend time taking college courses.

Further, urban schools should provide for easy reentry for those who have dropped out. What we have now is a structure where students become nonpersons. Once they leave there is no way to get back into the system.

I am suggesting that young adults should have available more flexible alternatives, especially young mothers who have perhaps dropped out because of childbirth.

Finally, to have better urban education we must give more autonomy to the local school and then hold principals and teachers accountable for the educational outcomes. Autonomy and accountability go together. What we have now are more regulatory obligations and less flexibility and freedom. This formula simply will not work. The rigid system will defeat enterprising teachers and drive principals to despair. What I am suggesting is that we give greater freedom to the schools but hold them accountable not on process but on outcomes, and we should define those outcomes very clearly.

I would add a related point. If year after year a school is not able to educate its children, it cannot be allowed to drift. The crisis calls for outside intervention, carefully guided to be sure, based on criteria that have been well established.

Is there any good news in all of this? I am encouraged that this nation continues to believe in public education. I am also encouraged that the spotlight is beginning to focus, once again, on urban education. And, as far I can tell, we agree, in large measure, on strategies to be pursued.

But is there a willingness to act? Let us agree that by the year 2000 all children who enrolled in school this year will leave high school with a quality education. To do less will shatter lives and imperil the future of our nation.

LEADERSHIP FOR SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING

Frank Newman
President
Education Commission of the States

The shape of things to come in education is much less clear than the sense that a new shape is necessary. But already there is a strong desire for two new imperatives.

Leadership is one such imperative that proves more difficult to define than to recognize. It has something to do with an ability to move people or institutions into uncharted territory. It has something to do with sureness of purpose and ingenuity in action. It has a great deal to do with concentrating and directing the energies of other people. It has only indirectly to do with hierarchy and authority, which are, after all, grounded in the status quo. Some deep sense that the leadership now desired in education is more a matter of attitude and ability than of position is evident in the calls for teachers who are leaders, principals who are leaders, leaders on school boards, leaders in state departments of education, state legislatures, and governors' offices. The desire is not for a more strictly vertical structure of decision-making but for people at all levels of the educational system to mobilize the abilities of their colleagues.

Restructuring our educational system is the second imperative. The issues addressed in the initial wave of 1980s-style educational reform were perhaps a necessary first step--increased accountability, higher standards, tougher professional requirements and so on. The aim of the first wave, in

many ways, was to strengthen the existing structure of the educational system, while leaving it essentially intact. But it appears the systematic changes we need are beyond the capacity of the existing structure.

Why?

- Students are more diverse. Nearly 40 percent of all public school students are members of minority groups. They come to school speaking more than 100 languages and dialects.
- The number of at-risk youth is increasing. Nearly one-fourth of American children live in poverty. Nearly one-fifth of females will get pregnant during their teens.
- The needs of the work force are changing. Because the labor force and population are predicted to grow very slowly over the next 15 years, fewer workers will be available--and 80 percent of the new additions to the work force will be women, minorities, and immigrants.
- Jobs will be requiring higher level skills; workers will change occupations three times and jobs six or seven times during their work lives.
- Our common curriculum is failing because it attempts to teach a universal body of knowledge to students from diverse backgrounds.
- Students need to integrate knowledge. Our system's emphasis on mechanical skills results in students who cannot make sense of discrete and unrelated bits of information.

Many education experts now agree that "restructuring" schools is the

best solution to solving some of these educational problems. William Glaser, in Control Theory in the Classroom, suggests an apt metaphor for the necessary transition to school restructuring:

> The schools are like a piston driven engine: good for what it can do, but obsolete if we want much power. Since it was first invented, it has been greatly improved as, indeed, we have improved our schools. But forty years ago, we recognized that we had reached the limits of this engine and that to attempt to improve it further was economically unsound. Because we wanted more power, we turned to a new structure, the jet engine.

This is the essence of the "restructuring" movement. It is the recognition that we have reached the limits of the structure of education now in place, and no amount of improvement on that structure will cause it to meet our future needs.

Schools that have already restructured provide different modes of instructional delivery and a variety of teaching styles which can include coaching, discussion, independent work, or socratic dialogue. These schools adjust to different learning styles among students and use strategies, such as cooperative learning and peer tutoring, to help students learn. Students become more responsible for their own learning, even as schools become more responsive to students' individual needs. There is flexible use of time, group size and composition. These schools frequently devote far greater effort to deciding what is important, then offer integrated curricular options, and engage more deeply and thoughtfully in the options offered. Restructuring almost always results in choice and diversity.

These new visions of schooling are not mere dreaming. In Successful Schools for Young Adolescents, Joan Lipsitz describes four successful middle schools that incorporate aspects of restructuring. Each of the four

is different from the others because each is tailored to meet the needs of the unique students, community, and teachers of the school. Theodore Sizer's "Coalition of Essential Schools" provides a network for a diverse group of newly restructured schools, working toward a set of overriding goals. These schools have in common an emphasis on these critical processes:

- Collaboration creates an expectation that people within a school or a system will work together to solve common problems. Time is provided and structures allow teachers to meet, reflect on their work, exchange philosophies and values, problem solve, and articulate curricular and student needs.
- Empowerment of all stakeholders in the education enterprise assures full, active, and mutual involvement in school decisions. Empowerment releases human potential, taps its diversity, and gives people greater ownership of and commitment to their work.
- Risk Taking and Innovation among teachers to experiment and innovate with new classroom strategies in a supportive, "no-fault" environment.

How can leaders encourage the processes that will lead to restructuring?

Educators have to be strong instructional leaders with a driving vision of what the school should be. This vision is shared with staff to develop clarity, purpose, and the means of achievement.

Leaders also need to emphasize a spirit of partnership that leads others to recognize both their right and responsibility to participate in the shared

vision of the school. To encourage empowerment, leaders need to trust and support the decisions made by staff without interfering in the process.

New leaders are teacher enablers. They provide opportunities for teachers to disagree, discuss, and solve problems, as well as to make decisions in open communication within the school.

The leadership we will look for to carry restructuring into the schools will come from individuals at all levels of the system with little in common but the willingness to step out of the comfortable (or uncomfortable, but familiar) ways of doing things. These new leaders will not be reformers or zealots; their distinguishing characteristic will be the willingness to take risks in order to change some portion of the system.

RESTRUCTURING THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM: AGENDA FOR THE 90'S

Michael Cohen
Associate Director of Educational Programs
National Governors' Association

The challenges facing the education system in this country now are fundamentally different than those we have addressed before. For a good part of the 1970's and up through the early part of the 1980's, most efforts at educational reform have been focused on improving the skills of the lowest performers in the education system. This is what minimum competency testing, "back to basics," and even more recent efforts to raise performance standards in education have involved.

Changes in the nature of the United States' relationship to the world economy, however, coupled with powerful and pervasive demographic trends, have rendered a continued focus on basic skills performance counterproductive, if not dangerous, to our future well-being. We now live in a world where the skill levels of our workforce is considerably lower than that in many developing and industrialized nations, while our wage rates are considerably higher. Therefore, a continuing focus on fairly routine basic skills can only result in a widening mismatch between the skills of the workforce and the educational demands of the workplace and the broader society.

It is by now commonplace to observe that the workforce of the future (the very near future) will need a substantial knowledge base as well as higher-order thinking skills. Such skills include the ability to communicate complex ideas, to analyze and solve complex problems, to identify order and find direction in an ambiguous and uncertain environment, to invent workable

solutions to non-routine and non-recurring problems, and to think and reason abstractly. This will require a deeper understanding of the subject matter students study, far beyond the memorization of definitions and formulas that we currently accept. Students require an ability to apply this knowledge in creative and imaginative ways, in novel contexts, and in collaboration with others.

Our school systems are not doing a very good job producing students with the kinds of skills we need. Currently, only a small proportion of high school graduates (roughly fifteen to twenty-five percent, according to the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) assessments in recent years) have acquired these skills. Approximately fifteen to twenty-five percent of our students drop out before graduating from high school; in urban areas the dropout rate is estimated to be somewhere closer to forty to fifty percent. According to NAEP, the vast majority of high school students can perform rudimentary reading, writing, and computation tasks, but not much else.

If we are unable to alter this situation dramatically, it will only get worse in the future. This is because a growing proportion of the school-age population--especially in urban areas--will be drawn from poor and minority backgrounds, from single-parent and female-headed households, from teenage parents, and from those who themselves have not completed high school. These, of course, are the demographic "markers" of those who are most likely to drop out of school or experience academic failure. This change in the composition of our school-age population is occurring at precisely the same time we can anticipate a worker shortage. Thus, we can no longer write off this segment of the population as we have in the past;

our future well-being is fundamentally dependent on their educational success.

In summary, the fundamental challenge facing our education system is to produce substantial changes in the level and distribution of educational outcomes that students who are now likely to fail ultimately acquire the knowledge and skills typically reserved for an elite segment of the student population. Moreover, the gains in outcomes required are proportionately greater than the likely increases in educational expenditures, even if funding increases continue at the pace they have over the past several years. Since 1983-84, there has been real growth in educational expenditures of more than twenty-five percent, and the state share of elementary and secondary expenditures now exceeds fifty percent. Investments should also be made in early childhood, higher education, and worker retraining programs, among others, to respond to the same economic and demographic challenges. Substantial productivity gains in education are essential at the same time that we must learn to use existing resources much more effectively than we currently do.

RESTRUCTURING THE EDUCATION SYSTEM

It is in the context of these urgent challenges that the National Governors' Association, the Carnegie Forum, and the Committee on Economic Development, among others, have called for a fundamental restructuring of the education system. This call has taken several forms, but it is unclear just what structures need to be "restructured" and how changes can be accomplished. There are several approaches to educational reform that merit special consideration.

First, we must invest in early intervention strategies for at-risk

youth. There is abundant evidence that investments and interventions made early in the lives of such students pay off handsomely in later life. Investments in quality preschool programs for disadvantaged youth, such as the "High Scope" model, result in improved school learning, less grade repetition, and reduced need for special education classes. Quality preschool programs can also reduce the high school dropout rate, increase college attendance rates, increase employment, and reduce welfare dependency and crime rates after high school. Quality preschool programs are also cost-effective in the long term, providing somewhere in the neighborhood of $4.50 in benefits from every dollar spent.

There are other early intervention strategies we need to employ as well. These include: encouraging pregnant teens and those with babies to stay in school, providing parenting education for both mothers and fathers, and ensuring that quality child care arrangements are available for teen-parents in school and for poor working mothers. These are all steps we must take to ensure that poor parents are able to provide their children with the kinds of support which are conditions for educational success.

Second, we need a comprehensive approach to delivering services to at-risk youth. This requires better use of exiting resources and programs to effectively target services for at-risk youth. Although schools must be at the center of our attempts to support and prepare these students, they cannot do it alone. No one agency of government, no single organization or industry, can produce a solution to the multiple problems of these students. The family, the church, public agencies, neighborhood organizations, and employers, must all be part of an effort to create and implement comprehensive intervention strategies. This means that we must

develop a network of support and services for each child who needs personal attention. We must draw together health and nutrition services, counseling services, recreation services, employment and training efforts, correctional programs, and other efforts of public and private agencies alike.

Important as these efforts are, however, they are not sufficient to the challenges we face. The primary challenge, I believe, is to restructure the elementary and secondary education system, from the classroom to the state house. This will require several interrelated steps.

At the school level, we must change the way we organize and deliver curriculum and instruction for students. This involves changing educational goals so they better reflect the needed emphasis on higher order skills. It also involves fundamentally changing the curriculum so that it reflects clearly the outcomes we value. This should entail: greater emphasis on higher order skills in the early grades; restructuring of the math and science curriculum so that we get more science and less time repeating instruction in the same math skills in the elementary grades; and restructuring the high school curriculum along inter-disciplinary lines. Fundamentally, it must allow for a deep understanding of subject matter, rather than simply broad but shallow exposure in which many topics are covered but few really understood.

Curricular changes cannot be accomplished effectively without a willingness to alter the way we organize instruction as well. For instance, we will need to organize time differently than we currently do, recognizing that meaningful interaction with challenging curriculum may require longer and more concentrated blocks of time than the traditional 45-minute class period. Because students learn at very different rates, we must be prepared to rethink how we group students for instructional purposes. Age-grading

students into classes of 25-35 students is neither the only nor the best way to group students for instruction. We need to make it possible for students to learn in both larger and smaller groups, to work independently or in cooperative groups, and to engage in peer tutoring.

These are examples of the elements of the learning environment which need to be restructured in order for students to learn what we expect them to. For each of these elements, and others, we have a basis in research and experience which can serve as a starting point for the design and implementation of new structural arrangements. Two additional important lessons from this knowledge base need to be kept in mind as we approach this task:

First, it is virtually impossible to alter just one of these components of the learning environment at a time. Curricular goals and content, the design of learning tasks and activities, the use and scheduling of instructional time, and instructional grouping practices are all integrally tied together. Changing one to any substantial degree requires, and permits, changes in the others at the same time.

Second, technical improvements in the organization of instruction are necessary but not sufficient steps to realize the student achievement gains we desire. Schools, after all, are social institutions, and their culture, norms, expectations, and mechanisms for involving teachers and students in their work are critical. Further, circumstances among schools, even within a single district, vary considerably. Schools require considerable autonomy to allow for the most sensible fit between particular forms of instructional organization and current practices, existing staff capabilities, and student and community needs. Consequently, restructuring schools does not entail

inventing a new set of structural arrangements that can be applied uniformly to all schools. Rather, it entails making it possible for schools to form and adjust their own structures and processes, as needed, to a far greater extent than occurs today.

Many districts have already taken significant steps in this direction, largely through the implementation of "effective schools" programs, in which school teams of teachers and administrators develop improvement plans for their buildings based on the effective schools research findings. In general, these efforts have proven successful in altering the culture of the school, by engaging teachers in shared decision-making, promoting a sense of collective responsiblilty for solving school problems, and highlighting and respecting the professional judgment of teachers. In many instances they have also resulted in improved student learning. By and large, however, they have not resulted in the substantial changes in curricular and instructional practices that will be advisable in the future. Accomplishing this will require substantial local district and state leadership combined with increased school level autonomy.

NEEDED CHANGES IN THE STATE ROLE

The state government has a special responsibility for restructuring the schools despite our traditonal dependence on local school districts for major innovations in the past. The states can advance the reform agenda by altering their more limited role in education. Several initiatives are readily apparent:

The first has to do with the establishment and assessment of educational goals. States, especially state boards of education, will need to establish

long range educational goals which adequately reflect the knowledge and higher order skills future graduates will need. Currently, few states take seriously their responsibility for setting meaningful educational goals. In many states, goal statements are either vague prescriptions to assist each youngster in reaching his full potential, or highly specified and lengthy lists of instructional objectives. States must find a useful middle ground which focuses educators' attention and efforts on the most important knowledge and skills, while still leaving them free to make curricular and instructional decisions about how to achieve them.

Setting appropriate goals will not help unless states also develop and adopt new assessment tools. To put it bluntly, if states continue to rely on standardized tests of basic skills or minimum competency tests as student outcome measures, little change will occur in schools. Because tests exert such a powerful influence on teaching practices, it will be critical for states to develop assessment tools which adequately reflect the higher order skills we value.

Second, beyond goal setting and assessment, states need to find ways of stimulating innovation and experimentation at the local level. States can provide leadership by:

- articulating a vision of restructured schools;
- encouraging local experimentation with various school structures;
- reducing unnecessary administrative and regulatory barriers to experimentation with promising approaches;
- providing ongoing implementation support and technical assistance to schools trying new approaches, and;
- researching and disseminating results to other schools.

Finally, states should develop new educational accountability systems in order to bring about the successful restructuring of schools. At its core, the issue here is the need to provide powerful incentives for improved performance at the school site level. Changes here may take the form of providing financial or other rewards (such as recognition, additional flexibility) to schools which show significant progress towards meeting the outcome goals as defined by the state, as well as meaningful sanctions for schools and districts that do not. This is a substantial change from current practice in which accountability systems focus largely on education inputs or practices rather than outcomes, do little to reward improved or even outstanding performance, and lack meaningful sanctions with which to address consistently low performance by schools or school systems.

RESTRUCTURING THE SCHOOLS: A PLAN FOR NEW YORK CITY

Leon M. Goldstein
President
Kingsborough Community College

Practically everyone would agree that meaningful change in the public school system in New York City is necessary in order to improve the teaching-learning process: the ultimate goal is for students to achieve a higher level academically than they are currently achieving. New Yorkers no longer want to tolerate the education of only part of the population. The prospect of equality and opportunity is not a cliché; these are objectives that we want to realize. The public will no longer accept the fact that only 40 percent or 50 percent of our students graduate from high school, or that 60 to 70 percent of black students that enter school in kindergarten never graduate. The general population is right to be disappointed and dismayed.

A number of strategies have been developed to address the massive problem of school dropouts. These include new modes of instruction, incentives for teachers, smaller class size, redefinition of educational and career goals, the assessment of performance in meeting these goals, new teaching strategies, and the twelve-month school year. These are but a few of the myriad of programs and proposals that have been and are currently being considered in New York City.

The school system can do a number of things to improve the schools. The teaching-learning process, however, should not terminate at the end of the day or even the school week. There is a strong correlation between the reinforcement of learning at home after the school day and

positive school achievement.

It is no secret that in minority and multiculture communities there is a breakdown in the family structure which mitigates against parental educational encouragement, support, and help for their children. More and more children are being born out of wedlock, and more and more students have no adult support system. In fact, what appears to be happening is that we are moving quickly into dividing New York City into two cultures: one reflecting the influence of the nurturing family on educational success, the other reflecting the influence of the lack of family structure.

It is my contention that the schools are limited in their ability to reverse the phenomenon of school dropout and academic failure in the absence of family support. Our special task is to recognize that community reinforcement can alleviate the problems of the broken marriage and single-parent home. Community-based institutions are required to insure that students are not left to fend for themselves. Peer pressure and the destructive culture of the streets must be replaced by environments that permit students to do homework, study, respect teachers, and aspire to success in school.

I have concluded that there are some truisms that are fundamental to any concept of community-based reinforcement structures:

1. We cannot impose values that mandate a strong family unity and educational support system regardless of how long and hard we work and talk about it. If such a nurturing environment is to come, it must come from within local urban communities and over a lengthy period of time.
2. We can all agree that a major reason for the difficulties faced by the students in our public school

system is derived from poverty, lack of proper housing, unemployment, poor health services and the like. It is unlikely that these conditions will change in a significant way in the near future. Therefore, the system will not be positively reinforced in the absence of newly created mediating institutions.

3. The present service organizations, such as New York City's Human Resources Administration, cannot substitue as a reinforcement system for parents or family.

With the infusion of more money and with some of the positive changes that are taking place in our school system, student learning will be only incrementally affected. Additional resources by themselves will not have a major effect on student achievement. This is so despite the dedication of teachers and administrators who work tirelessly in the school system to achieve positive results. What the schools need is a recognition that incremental reform and the promotion of a diverse program of change will promote educational progress in an urban setting such as New York City.

Dedication to educational reform should not require a complementary commitment to a reform program that must be systemic and total in its impact on the schools. My approach to restructuring New York City's schools rests on a plan that is simple in concept and based on the real life of New York City families and neighborhoods.

Consider the following proposal to establish "Community Centers for Learning and Study Skills" (CLASS) in New York City:

- Let us restructure education by addressing first those academic impairments that begin outside the formal

schooling now provided in almost 1,000 New York City schools.

- The end of the school day and, therefore, the end of the teaching-learning process at 3 p.m. is an arbitrary time that creates and reinforces the concept of an artificially limited educational day. Students should be encouraged in as many ways as possible to continue studying the work that they have learned in school during afternoon and evening hours.
- It may be advisable to shorten the formal school day to approximately 3 to 4 hours of instruction in order to encourage or mandate attendance for homework, study, and support services during the day and several evening hours each week.
- It is essential for some students to receive remedial and compensatory help in the form of tutoring. More gifted students should receive support and enrichment so that they can maximize their potential.

Accordingly, community learning centers should be set up in areas to be designated throughout the city. These centers, CLASS, would provide the following: tutorials; areas for study and homework; support for gifted students; and career, academic, and personal counseling. For the centers to operate effectively, they must be staffed and administered by Board of Education professionals with support from the local community population. Centers could be open from 3 p.m. to 9 p.m. and one or two weekend days at sites that are carefully chosen. These could include local schools,

especially high schools, community churches, libraries, buildings that house the telephone company or the gas company, or virtually any other suitable neighborhood-based site that might be used as a local learning center. The important point is that children and young adults who attend school in that community would have a place to do their homework, receive support from a teacher-adult aide, and finally and most importantly, find peer group support for the advancement of education and learning.

Supplemental community learning and study sites can provide the environment, resources, spirit, and peer support that would supplement the work that is done in the traditional classroom.

My proposal should be implemented in stages. I would begin with different racial and ethnic student bodies. The experiences here in program development and services should be carefully evaluated and changed where necessary before expansion to other centers.

The best way to begin this program would be the organization of a task force to develop, within a reasonable amount of time, the specific model for such centers. I am aware that other community-type centers have been established in New York City with little or no funding; they have been largely recreational or used as meeting places for community groups. The task force would: propose an initial set of CLASS programs and services; recommend staffing; provide needed materials and physical design; project future budgets; develop a student recruitment program; involve community leaders; gain parental, Board of Education, union, and governmental support; and most importantly, develop specific teaching and study strategies.

Changes in our system will only take place through our tenacity and courage to overcome overwhelming odds. In today's economy, unskilled and

semi-skilled jobs are dwindling at an alarming rate, and as the dropout rate increases, more and more students will be unemployable. Businesses and industries are demanding that applicants possess basic skills as a minimum foundation for on the job learning because the cost of training programs for the entirely unskilled has become prohibitive. The poor and unemployed demand strategies that reach beyond the current structure of education. Implementing CLASS may be one such strategy.

THE DETROIT DROPOUT PREVENTION COLLABORATIVE

Arthur Jefferson
Superintendent
Detroit Public Schools

The Detroit Dropout Prevention Collaborative will develop a comprehensive plan designed to reduce the dropout rate in Detroit. That is the Collaborative's goal and the mission of the Detroit Public Schools, and we have dedicated ourselves to this endeavor. We believe our efforts, through collaboration, will make a significant difference in the dropout rates in Detroit.

DEMOGRAPHIC SNAPSHOT

The Setting of the City

Detroit is the largest city in Michigan and the sixth largest city in the nation. According to the 1980 Census, its population was a little over 1.2 million people with a racial composition of 63.1 percent Black, 34.4 percent White, and 2.4 percent Spanish. The population has been dwindling, however, at a rate of about 1.5 percent each year.

Detroit is no different than any other large, urban metropolis in the country. We share many common problems associated with large urban centers. Our city also has some unique features that make it stand apart from urban areas such as New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles.

In recent years, Detroit's economic base has been declining. The unemployment rates have been over 20 percent each year since 1979. There is a high level of poverty and a declining median income level. Detroit is a major center of automobile manufacturing, the largest single industry in

the world. It is a top ranking industrial center in the United States for the production of machine tool accessories, stampings, hardware, and chemicals. It is understandable, then, that Detroit's economy is, to a large degree, dependent on the automobile industry, and it is critical that this enterprise specifically provide job opportunities for the population.

Many of the factories and businesses have converted to high technology operations. For this reason, it is vital that our schools begin to prepare young people for the changing job market that will be available in the twenty-first century. Today, dropouts in Detroit who were normally absorbed on the assembly lines in our factories no longer have that opportunity available to them. This condition has exacerbated the economic problem in more ways than one. First, the business community is dependent on schools to produce students with suitable skills, therefore, dropouts are an unreliable resource. Second, we force our dropouts into a situation where the alternatives for them are less than desirable: either a fast food job or service job paying a minimum wage, living on public assistance, or a life of crime associated with drugs.

The School District

The Detroit Public School System is the sixth largest public school district in the United States. The district has an enrollment of just under 200,000 students, including the adult education population. The Detroit Public School System has 164 elementary schools, 59 middle schools, 2 middle school development centers, 23 comprehensive high schools, 1 high school development center, 5 vocational/technical centers, 18 special education schools, and 6 alternative schools. This enrollment is dwindling at about the same rate as the urban population. Added to this problem is

the phenomenon of early school dropouts. Detroit's annual dropout rate is approximately 14 percent, which represents 7,000 students who leave school each year before graduation. A study was recently conducted in which student educational status was tracked for a four-year period. These results showed a 41 percent dropout rate.

This demographic snapshot of Detroit is designed to suggest the multitude of problems that large, urban school districts have in common. In spite of challenges that confront us, we accept the initiation of the collaborative effort underwritten by the Ford Foundation. Several significant activities have taken place in the Detroit Public Schools in the last several years that have laid a solid foundation for the success of this present collaborative effort.

Classroom Partners/TV 56

Two years ago, the Detroit Public Schools collaborated with one of our local television stations in a project called "Classroom Partners." This undertaking involved the production of a one-hour documentary called "Sidewalk High" depicting the dropout problem for Detroit Public School youth. In preparation for airing this documentary on local television, a series of meetings were held at each of the 22 high schools. There were two aims. First, an effort was made to fully apprise the community of the dropout problem and its impact on the individual and society. Second, we solicited suggestions from the community regarding solutions to the problem. The documentary was shown on television in a town hall setting which permitted the general community to call in regarding the dropout problem and possible solutions. As a result of this effort, we developed community awareness of the severity of the dropout problem. The most significant part

of this effort was the community's recognition that the dropout problem is not just a school problem, a parent problem, or a student problem--but a problem belonging to the whole community. This awareness and support permitted us to eliminate "finger-pointing" and, more importantly, laid the groundwork for the present collaborative effort.

Adopt-A-School

Adopt-A-School program was a forerunner of our current collaborative effort. This is similar to the national effort whereby corporations and businesses formally adopt a school and provide various resources to assist their educational efforts. Detroit has approximately 120 of these business partnerships operating within our school system. This program made the business community more aware of and committed to the problems of urban education.

Dropout Link

In order to demonstrate to the outside community the school district's commitment to lower dropout rates, a document was drafted called "The Dropout Prevention Link." This pamphlet was intended as a public relations piece that described the kinds of programs that had been operational for years in the Detroit Public Schools. In addition, it offered suggestions for new programs to be developed.

The Process

The goal of the Ford Foundation Collaborative effort was to develop a comprehensive dropout prevention plan specifically designed to reduce the Detroit dropout rate. This group had representatives from all key elements of the city--the mayor's office, police department, judicial system, churches,

parents, school district staff, board members, students, and others. Because we asked for involvement from all these important constituents, I felt it important to chair this collaborative effort in order to demonstrate the commitment of the school district. It became immediately clear that if we were to succeed, I would need to direct appropriate resources for coordination of this effort. I, therefore, reorganized some internal priorities and assigned staff to complete this task. A detailed plan of action was presented to the Collaborative. This plan was formally adopted and put into operation in December, 1986.

There were four objectives outlined for accomplishing our goals:

- Expand our existing data base system so that we would have descriptive as well as prescriptive capabilities in matching specific causes for dropping out to specific strategies.
- Gather and synthesize information about the causes of early school leaving and concurrently investigate operating programs that were aimed at reducing this number.
- Develop a comprehensive dropout prevention plan which consists of a variety of strategies directly addressing dropout causes.
- Design a program for evaluating the effectiveness of the dropout prevention plan.

This approach was translated into four task forces, one for each proposed objective. To make sure that this was truly collaborative, co-chairpersons were selected from those involved for each task force; one from the business community and one from the school district. The response from the community was encouraging. Task force membership varied from 40 to 120 members. They worked diligently for months to accomplish their objectives.

The Collaborative met every other month to receive reports from the operating task forces and to offer recommendations and/or endorsements of

their efforts. An interesting development occurred at this time that added considerable strength to our efforts. Student Council members from the Collaborative asked for permission to create a separate student task force to submit their dropout prevention recommendations. I agreed to this request and, hence, a fifth task force was created, chaired by students. Every high school in the school district was represented. As a result of their efforts, a student conference was held at Wayne State University with representatives from all high schools, middle schools, and members of the student council, as well as students who were considered dropouts. Students planned the conference, chaired the workshop sessions, and developed a list of recommendations. The media responded to this unique way of involving youngsters, and our students were interviewed by local news television networks. Their recommendations were added to those of the Strategy Task Force and included as a part of the comprehensive plan. Implementation of the plan will include a student component as an integral part of the strategy.

To develop the plan, a group of writers were organized representing the school system and the community. That group emerged with our comprehensive dropout prevention plan, "Vested Interest Program," or VIP.

It was agreed that adopting the concept of a "very important program" which dealt with a "very important student population" would provide the appropriate image necessary to make this program successful. We are operating under the philosophy that the leaders of the community believe that our young people can learn and achieve, and want our efforts to be productive.

In developing the VIP, the writing team agreed to utilize the following

guidelines. Planning should:

1. Be manageable and specific enough so that it can be converted into an action program.

2. Be legitimate so that the entire community will be willing to support it.

3. Have a clearly identifiable population so that programs can be charted and students tracked.

4. Identify both school and community programs that are working so that support can be provided or expansion can be facilitated.

5. Be research-based, wherever posssible, so that we can immediately take advantage of the information gathered from existing programs.

6. Offer recommendations for consolidation, expansion and/or coordination of dropout prevention efforts.

7. Have short- and long-range objectives.

8. Be designed so that individual elements can be implemented independent of the total.

9. Have the standard characteristics of sound planning: objectives, person responsible, rationale, resources, time tables, cost, and evaluations.

10. Attempt to attack some of the basic reasons why students drop out of school.

11. Indicate the specific responsibilities of parents, students, school, and community in this effort.

12. Identify resources needed to accomplish its specific goals.

13. Have strong student involvement.

The Plan

The writing team used the operational guidelines to develop 14 strategies which are divided into two phases. The Collaborative agreed

that the Ford Foundation grant was only to provide us with the necessary impetus to get the plan started and that we were determined to continue to implement the resulting strategies and recommendations whether or not additional Ford Foundation funding was available.

Phase One--District Components

Phase One, scheduled for this school year, includes district components dealing with coordination of planning, business education partnerships, collaboration, peer influence, and public relations.

Phase One--School Components

The Interim Action or school components deals with (1) pre-school programs, (2) academic achievement in kindergarten and grades 3, 5, and 8, (3) attendance in the kindergarten through grade 8, (4) "citizenship" in kindergarten through grade 8, and (5) Project 700 designed for high school students. Each component has specified tasks and timetables. As a result, an interim action program was launched at the beginning of the 1987-88 school year. One of our first objectives was to provide pre-school for 4-year olds who were born to adolescent mothers. Using a Wayne State University grant, and in cooperation with social agencies within the city, the Early Childhood Education Department and our computerized Information Systems, we identified and provided these 4-year olds with a pre-school experience while simultaneously providing opportunities to the teenaged mothers.

A second effort was launched to deal with lack of achievement. Computerized lists of failures were prepared and presented to administrators in charge of schools. A Blueprint for Success was a document developed to be used by schools to bring as many students as possible up to

grade level. Research locally and nationally suggests that students failing at any level are significantly more likely to drop out of school than those who do not fail. Our objective is to provide appropriate resources for these students so that they can develop with their peers. Another collaborative grant was developed by the Business/Education Alliance of the Greater Detroit Chamber of Commerce in cooperation with the Detroit Public Schools. The school district was awarded a VISTA grant to train volunteers and students who have failed. Training of the volunteers has already started. This is another indication of the commitment, support, and dedication of our community to help us solve the dropout problem.

A third problem being addressed concerns those students who exhibit high rates of absenteeism. This is a preventive effort for the kindergarten through grade 8. We are in the process of identifying this target population and reviewing the kinds of school and community resources available to apply to this problem. Our objective for the elementary schools is to have 90 percent average daily attendance.

The fourth preventive effort attempts to create a data base for those students who are beginning to exhibit unacceptable behavior. "Citizenship" is defined in Detroit as the ability to get along with one another. Citizenship information on students, kindergarten through grade 8, who have been excluded or put on short-term suspension is now on the data base. A school-by-school printout is being developed so that we will be able to access that information and target resources such as mentoring, the Adopt-A-School program, and others to provide immediate assistance. Project 700 is an attempt to retain those high school students who have considerably fewer grade credits than other students their age. Project 700 is so

named because our goal is to retain at least 700 students this year from among the 7,000 anticipated dropouts--a dropout reduction of 10 percent. Specifically, there are three categories of students we are attempting to reach: (1) 15-1/2 year olds who have earned less than 50 hours of credit, (2) students who are 17 years or older and have earned less than 100 hours of credit, and (3) students who have been in school longer than four years but have not earned enough credits for a diploma.

There have been limited resources and, therefore, limited opportunities to provide some alternatives to these target student populations. Each high school was expected to develop a specific plan for Project 700 students. In addition, a special attempt was made to contact this population via volunteers and paraprofessionals. Through the use of a computerized list of students, volunteers called the homes of these students and asked questions to determine the specific problems keeping youngsters from continuing their education. Once these problems were identified and recorded on a pre-developed profile, a follow-up procedure was initiated, and appropriate departments were notified of the student's reasons for not returning to school.

Phase Two

Phase Two of our dropout prevention effort will be launched as soon as resources become available. The components of this phase deal with prevention and intervention activities relating to teen pregnancy, substance abuse, a retrieval focus providing alternative educational programs for those who have already dropped out of school, a summer school remedial program, and a transition program for the fifth and eighth graders entering middle schools

and high schools respectively.

KEY ELEMENTS TO A SUCCESSFUL COLLABORATIVE EFFORT

There are many key elements that are essential to making a collaborative a meaningful partnership based on our experience in Detroit:

1. We must recognize that this Collaborative is one of long duration since the problems we are attempting to solve require long-term solutions. There are certainly some quick fix approaches that might produce immediate effects, but if we are to solve the problem on a long-term basis, more than just a superficial cure is needed.

2. Community readiness is essential. The community must be knowledgeable about the consequences and results of the dropout problem and the resources required to address it. Once that is accomplished, support and commitment from the community can be mobilized.

3. In order to eliminate some of the concern that the community has about the schools, the schools must be willing to communicate openly with the entire community and to share their problems, frustrations, and failures so that credibility can be established and maintained. A willingness to permit outsiders to examine our structure and policies, and, more importantly, a willingness to change them, is an essential ingredient in meaningful collaborative participation.

4. The leadership of the collaborative must be clearly identified as coming from the top. I assumed the responsibility of chairing the collaborative effort, and I selected individuals from my staff who had the dedication and commitment to get the job done. Those decisions send messages to the community that the school district is taking dropout prevention seriously and making it a high priority.

5. Collaborative involvement in developing the plan with an equal sharing of responsibilities is essential in order to create a feeling of ownership and responsibility on everyone's part.

6. In launching any collaborative effort, one must be sure that there is commitment to the effort within one's own organizational structure before expecting the outside community to become a part of such a collaborative.

7. Open communication between all segments of the collaborative is important in maintaining its momentum. Progress and failures, pertinent facts, figures, and statistics must be shared by all involved parties on an ongoing basis. A successful collaborative effort must recognize the identity of individual organizations, identifying their special needs and concerns, and must not threaten through power struggles or political motives to assume that it has all the answers to the problem. It must be flexible enough so that organizations can meet their own agendas while giving full support to the collaborative. There must be a willingness to have organizations take on individual responsibilities and be recognized for their efforts.

8. There must be a strong commitment by the media to support the effort. Our Collaborative had representatives from major television and radio stations, and our three leading newspapers. They must be willing to communicate with the general community and provide the necessary motivation and information to keep the collaborative moving forward.

SUMMARY

In Detroit we view this experience as an opportunity and are excited about its success. We have high expectations and welcome the concept of shared responsibility in helping to resolve this serious problem. We look to create success stories that will breed success for our students. We do not expect miracles to happen overnight. We know we will be confronted with problems, setbacks, and frustrations, but they are easier to deal with when we join hands with others and confront the problem in a unified, collaborative fashion.

We must be cautious that we do not focus attention totally on the student, and expect students to make all of the adjustments. We must constantly be willing to look at ourselves and whatever institution we represent--home, church, school, or busines--and ask: "What can I do to

change the kind of environment that is forcing students into a situation where education is not their highest priority?" We must instill in the minds of our young people and in our community the knowledge that education is essential to open the doors to greater opportunity.

THE MEMPHIS DROPOUT PREVENTION COLLABORATIVE

Willie W. Herenton
Superintendent
Memphis City School System

Like many urban school districts, the Memphis City School System is confronted by an unacceptably high dropout rate. The Memphis Urban Dropout Prevention Collaborative was initiated as a result of a Ford Foundation planning grant. The goals established for the Collaborative were: 1) to bring school, community, and business together in addressing this issue which affects the total community; 2) to identify local causes for dropouts; 3) to develop a dropout profile; and 4) to develop a plan for dropout prevention in Memphis. In accordance with those goals, the planning year began in October, 1986, with the formation of the Memphis Collaborative, and will culminate in late November, 1987, with the completion and subsequent presentation of a dropout prevention plan to the Memphis community.

Collaborative Composition

The Memphis Collaborative is a group of approximately thirty-five interested individuals from the Memphis City School System and a variety of community organizations, agencies, and businesses. Memphis City Schools personnel from a dozen areas, divisions, or departments joined with members from outside the system representing such organizations and companies as Girls' Clubs of Memphis, the Tennessee Children's Services Commission, Op-Act, Bethany Homes for Pregnant Teenagers, Juvenile Court, Jobs for Tennessee Graduates, Memphis Rotary Club, Memphis Housing

Corporation, Memphis Park Commission, Memphis Partners-Holiday Corporation, Memphis State University Human Services Co-op, Shelby State Community College, IBM, Federal Express, McDonald's, Peat Marwick, Mitchell and Company, Catholic Charities, United Way, and the Memphis Volunteer Center.

As with any group of this size, some members have been more vocal and active than others, some have offered support without a great deal of participation, and a few are no longer involved. The remaining members have formed a network and group cohesiveness that resulted from sustained contact, sharing, and working together.

Major Accomplishments

The Ford Foundation Urban Dropout Collaborative is responsible for establishing a more accurate, realistic dropout figure for the Memphis City Schools. For the first time this figure included students who did not return to school after the summer vacation as well as those who left during the school year. As a result, the system's dropout figure has risen from three percent to an estimated fifteen percent.

The Collaborative also contributed to the ongoing process of data collection by providing valuable input to an existing Memphis City Schools committee charged with developing a formula to compute more accurately the system's dropout rate. The committee focused on ways to purify data used in the formula, which together with a new cross-filing system will yield not only more accurate data, but also will produce a computerized list identifying the students who have left our system. The new data collection procedures will be reflected in the 1987-88 attendance documents.

A local dropout profile was developed through a two-part process which first examined the data on eight variables from the school system's

computerized Student Master File and then examined the permanent records of a sample of students who had dropped out of school. The local profile identified a typical dropout in our system as usually black and more often male than female. The typical dropout was in the tenth grade, was overaged for that grade, was experiencing academic difficulties, and was excessively absent. The typical dropout often reads as much as three years below grade level, has failed at least one grade, and has attended three or more elementary and/or junior high schools. The most often failed grade by a student was the first, followed by the seventh and/or tenth. The student's reading deficiency usually began in the first grade, and did not receive any Special Education services.

Further accomplishments of the Collaborative included a review of the national dropout literature and research regarding causes, characteristics, and strategies for dealing with the dropout; the development and circulation of two surveys, one directed to the community and one to individual schools in order to determine what programs related to dropout prevention were already operating; and the sharing of ideas within the Collaborative and with other represented groups. The Collaborative also gave impetus to the establishment of dropout prevention as a priority for all Memphis City Schools counselors in grades K-12 for the 1987-88 school year.

Directions of the Collaborative

From local data as well as the national data, the following directions have emerged as basic principles for dropout prevention for the Memphis Collaborative:

1. Early identification and intervention are imperative for any far reaching or long lasting effect on the dropout problem;

2. Coordination and capitalization of the existing resources of the system and larger community to better deal with this problem;
3. Extension of thoughtful, planned interventions that include the summer months to prevent the "at risk" student from falling further behind between school years.

Recommendations

The Ford Foundation Urban Dropout Prevention Collaborative has presented the following recommendations to the Superintendent for review with projected target dates for implementation:

1. To continue and to revitalize the Collaborative with a broadened vision and new charge to maintain the vehicle established for sharing between inside/outside participants' concerns and solutions regarding the far reaching dropout issue. (January, 1988)
2. To assign a Dropout Prevention Coordinator to coordinate the activities of the Collaborative and the intervention strategies directly initiated by the Collaborative. (January, 1988)
3. To implement a public awareness campaign directed internally and externally: a) to heighten awareness of the extent of the dropout problem as one affecting the total community, b) to prescribe a variety of solutions intended to trigger other ideas for solutions, and c) to elicit support for dropout prevention in concrete ways from all facets of the community. (January, 1988)

4. To establsih dropout prevention as a Memphis City Schools systemwide goal. (1988-89 school year)
5. To adopt dropout prevention as a priority for the system's existing school/business partnership through the Adopt-A-School Division. (1988-89 school year)
6. To implement a targeted pilot project involving all segments of the targeted community with "at risk" students. (1988-89 school year)

We recognized that a reduction in the dropout rate cannot occur rapidly, and this program proved there are no quick fixes. Only through broad-based collaborative efforts will solutions be found to arrest the dropout phenomenon in urban public schools.

RESTRUCTURING THE CURRICULUM

Diane G. Berreth
Director of Field Services
Association for Supervision and
Curriculum Development

"Perestroika" (restructuring) is sweeping the U.S.S.R. today. In a similar fashion, "restructuring" is a rising tide in the American school reform movement. Both movements share a sense of change and excitement along with a sense of mistrust and vagueness; each movement is as yet imprecise in its specific goals and expectations. For American education basic questions remain. What is restructuring? What would a restructured educational system, school, or curriculum look like?

No one doubts that for most of us the vision of restructured schools is uncertain. What is clear are some of the issues we face in moving toward the future we want for American education. Those of us in curriculum work are being challenged both internally and externally to improve the curriculum so that all students achieve more than minimum levels of academic excellence.

But what is "curriculum" when viewed from the perspective of educational reform? Allan Glatthorn defines curriculum as "the plans made for guiding learning in schools . . . and the implementation of those plans in the classroom . . . ." In this broad definition, instruction is included as part of curriculum. What is taught and how it is taught are not separated. In Glatthorn's view curriculum is comprised of what is written, taught, and learned. A "curriculum" also includes the impact of the

organizational environment on what is learned. This "hidden curriculum" is described by such scholars as Dreeben who emphasize beliefs about cooperation, competition, and rule-following that help to shape our group and individual behavior as adults.

Glatthorn also distinguishes between the mastery curriculum and the organic curriculum. He views the mastery curriculum as made up of the "hard-core" objectives viewed as essential for all students. The mastery curriculum requires systematic planning and explicit teaching. In contrast, the organic, or "soft-core" curriculum is not taught in a systematic, structured manner. The organic curriculum addresses affective outcomes, such as the practice of democratic values and a positive self-image. This organic curriculum is supported through ongoing teacher attention and the use of appropriate teaching occasions as they arise.

To restructure the curriculum, then, is to change the makeup or organization of the plans for learning and the implementation of those plans in the classroom. In other words, restructuring would affect both the content and the organization of the curriculum.

Does curriculum need restructuring? Many critics say yes. There is an increased emphasis on academics in American schools today which is rooted in new knowledge, new competition, and new standards. Information is increasing exponentially and this places new demands on schools. As an example, new information and emphasis on health and fitness is affecting the curriculum in physical education and home economics. Recent advances in biology and physics are changing the content of those courses as well as our understanding of what general science knowledge all graduates need.

Along with increasing knowledge has come a demand for sound academic

programs arising out of concern regarding the nation's competitive position in world affairs. Numerous reports have posited a relationship between our international political and economic status and the education our students receive. In the "global village" of the contemporary and future world, our students will need improved understanding and skills in working with foreign countries.

Demands are also on the increase for improved performance and higher standards for all of our students. Graduation requirements are increasing while elective courses are declining. Critics claim, for example, that a knowledge of American history will result in an improved national character. Concurrent with an emphasis on basic knowledge, educators are being pressed to integrate higher-order thinking skills into the curriculum. In addition, there is a demand for better textbooks; textbooks that are not simplistic, superficial, and dull. These demands have set up an unreconciled tension between those who emphasize the process of learning and those who emphasize content.

The emphasis on curriculum content is matched by interest in curriculum organization and delivery. Educational researchers are developing new and exciting models for curriculum organization. Among these, outcome-based education and cooperative learning show special promise.

Outcome-based education refers to instruction in which the learning achievements of students, rather than time and schedule factors, govern their place and movement through the curriculum. Outcome-based education is characterized by flexible grouping, increased academic learning time, sequenced curricular units, and frequent diagnostic evaluation. It has been demonstrated to elevate the achievement levels of students from any

ability group over what other whole-group instruction achieves.

Cooperative learning, another productive instructional model, structures lessons cooperatively so that students work together toward common goals. The elements of cooperative learning include small group organizations, shared responsibility, and criteria-referenced evaluation. Cocperative learning results in increased achievement, more positive attitudes toward the subject, and improved socialization and self-esteem. Cooperative learning approaches are examples of re-organizing both the mastery and the organic curriculum.

These models seem to offer substantial increases in student achievement through changes in curriculum content, organization, and instruction. They represent examples of the way the latest innovations in educational research may be utilized to fulfill growing demands for a restructured curriculum.

Given the continuing interest in educational change that centers on both the makeup and organization of our plans for learning and what we teach, several important issues remain on the reform agenda. Educators are challenged to:

1. accommodate the additive effect of increasing knowledge;
2. define a core curriculum that responds to both the process and content needs of students;
3. design staff development that increases student learning;
4. support teachers in broadening their repertoire of skills through adequate resources.

These challenges will require difficult choices. If curricular restructuring occurs in isolation, without changes in school organization and resources, it will almost surely fail. No curriculum can increase in

both depth and breadth without more skill and more time, both of which cost money. If, however, curriculum content and organization are examined with a commitment to achievement by all students, the issues we face can be resolved successfully. We know from current trends that some restructuring can work and various existing educational models afford important guidelines to further progress in curriculum reform. It is important to recognize, however, that the "doing" will be complex, lengthy, and require significant resources and commitment.

RESTRUCTURING SCHOOLS

Holly M. Houston
Coalition of Essential Schools
Brown University

The notion of "restructuring schools" has a fashionable ring these days. Given the rate at which fashions change in the world of education, I will be delighted by its popularity if, over time, this idea results in the thoughtful overhaul of schools and the consequent enhancement of what students know and are able to do. I will be deeply disappointed, however, if "restructuring" remains an ill-defined concept that is offered as a mere palliative to a public and a profession demanding more of schools, teachers, students, the economy, and the democratic process.

Schools are among the most conservative of institutions and have changed little over the past eighty years. Certainly there are more of them today than at the turn of the century, but this merely reflects an increase in the number of eligible youngsters. The menu of offerings and services has increased, too. This came about, however, as schools assumed responsibility not only for education, but also for socialization and democratization. Schools purport to do more and are more pervasive today than in 1900, but their structure has changed little. As at the turn of the century, we find today that knowledge is neatly packaged to correspond with the scholarly disciplines. We find that these packages are uniform in duration: each class period lasts approximately fifty minutes and is punctuated by a mechanical bell. Our model for schooling was handed to us by industry and, to extend the industrial metaphor, many people feel that

our "products" are no longer up to standard, particularly in a world marketplace. According to a range of respectable measures, our students are not adequately prepared to participate in society as careful and imaginative thinkers and doers.

Many people across the country believe that schools can do a significantly better job of educating youngsters than they do at present. Some of these people are the teachers and school or district administrators who have allied themselves with the "Coalition of Essential Schools" over the past three years. Members of the Coalition's constituency are remarkably diverse: small rural schools, medium-sized suburban schools, and larger urban schools. One particular area of concern is the striking incongruity between educational aims and the day-to-day practices in the larger urban schools. It is in those highly bureaucratized institutions that there appears the greatest disparity between what intelligent adults know is educationally necessary for students and what they feel capable of delivering. Even as these adults recognize that the present mode of schooling is inadequate, they find few incentives for imagining and creating a school environment that would be any better.

What we must do as policy makers and leaders in the field of education is to provide our school colleagues with incentives for three fundamental types of work: incentives for thoughtful goal setting, for careful problem framing, and for collaborative problem solving. Together these elements of organizational life can have a profound influence on the structure of schools.

Goals, Problems, Collaboration

One pervasive characteristic of modern educational institutions is

that they tend to go about the business of processing youngsters without giving much thought to tangible intellectual goals. How many schools employ their formal mission statement as a guide in decision making about educational priorities? How many high schools claim that their diploma signifies anything of value, such as the graduate's ability to read or write? There are a few schools that do this, but they are the exceptions that illustrate the inadequacy of the norm. Schools need to be clear about their priorities and their aims. They need incentives for doing the hard work associated with goal setting and planning. Those few bold educational leaders who are attempting simultaneously to focus attention on specifiable educational goals and reinvest the high school diploma with meaning deserve our commendation. Such recognition would itself be a powerful incentive.

Problem framing also is a rather alien concept to educators not because they lack ability, but because they typically are hard pressed for time by a public seeking quick results. Identifying problems is slow, disciplined work. And we, as leaders and policy makers, do little that suggests to teachers and administrators that painstaking clarity in the identification of problems is desirable or necessary. Instead, we all spend our time attacking symptoms; a typical example is the distorted concern over issues of "classroom management." Rarely are teachers and counselors encouraged to approach the problem of classroom management as though disruptive cases were the logical outgrowth of large classes or boring textbooks. Instead, we short-circuit this exercise by taking for granted a whole range of institutional features. By refusing to investigate the appropriateness of status quo structures and habits, we overlook the capacity for analysis and reflection that a good many

educators possess. Schools do not become self-correcting because so little incentive is provided for mature problem framing and resolution. Much more of this work can and should be done at the school.

Equally important is the need for collaboration. Many educational reformers recognize that the solitary nature of teaching is an impediment to intelligent problem framing and resolution. Collaborative problem framing and solving is the best avenue for professional development, but it is also the least explored and understood. Professional development for teachers commonly means three hours of didactic presentation by an outside authority. The impact of these exercises is a deepening of the cynicism that public school teachers feel toward those who manipulate them from the top. A radically different strategy is needed if teachers are to become the solvers of problems that they and their students face in schools. A central feature of any such strategy should be collaboration on problem solving that has direct bearing on work in schools. Collaboration, then, may be a means to a whole host of desirable ends. Again, incentives are needed.

These three themes--goal setting, problem framing, and collaborative problem solving--are central to any discussion of educational improvement or school restructuring. They are important because they are fundamental; they connote the engagement of individuals in the slow process of organizational overhaul. The restructuring of schools will only come about through teacher-by-teacher, student-by-student, parent-by-parent engagement with the problems of educational reform. The best we can do from the outside is offer coherent incentives for responsible experimentation within.

THE COOPERATIVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL*

Robert E. Slavin
Center for Research on Elementary
and Middle Schools
Johns Hopkins University

Cooperative learning refers to a set of instructional methods in which students work in small, mixed-ability learning groups. Usually, the groups have four members--one high achiever, two average achievers, and one low achiever. The students in each group are responsible not only for learning the material being taught in class, but also for helping their groupmates learn. Often, there is some sort of group goal; in the Student Team Learning methods developed at Johns Hopkins University, students can earn certificates if group averages exceed a pre-established criterion of excellence. The overall concept recommends cooperation as the springboard to educational success.

The simplest form of Student Team Learning, called Student Teams-Achievement Division (STAD), consists of a regular cycle of activities. It might begin when the teacher presents a lesson to the class. Then students work in their four-member, mixed-ability teams to master the material the teacher has presented. Students usually have worksheets or other materials. Study strategies within the teams depend on the subject matter. In math, students might study problems and then compare answers, discussing and

---

* This article was adapted from "Cooperative Learning and the Cooperative School" currently in press. It was written under funding from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U. S. Department of Education (Grant No. OERI-G-86-006). The opinions expressed are mine, however, and do not necessarily reflect OERI positions or policy.

resolving any discrepancies. In spelling, students might drill one another on spelling lists. In social studies, students might work together to find information in the text relating to key concepts. Regardless of the subject matter, students are encouraged to explain ideas or skills to one another, not to just give one another answers.

At the end of the team study period, students take brief individual quizzes on which they cannot help one another. The results of the quizzes are put together to form team scores, using a system which assigns points based on how much students have improved over their own past records. The evaluation process is one in which both individual and collective learning provide measures of educational progress.

Successful Conditions for Cooperative Learning

Cooperative learning is always fun; it almost always produces gains in such social outcomes as race relations, and it has never been found to reduce student achievement in comparison to traditional methods. A substantial body of research has established, however, that two conditions must be fulfilled if cooperative learning is to significantly enhance student achievement. First, students must be working toward a group goal, such as earning certificates or other recognition. Second, success at achieving this goal must depend on the individual learning of all group members.

When cooperative learning methods provide group goals based on the learning of all group members, the effects on student achievement are remarkably consistent. On 38 studies of at least four weeks' duration which compared cooperative methods of this type to traditional control methods, 33 found significantly greater achievement for the cooperatively

taught classes, and five found no significant differences. In contrast, only four of 20 studies which evaluated forms of cooperative learning lacking group goals based on group members' learning found positive achievement effects.

Studies of cooperative learning have been completed in urban, rural, and suburban schools in the United States, Canada, Israel, West Germany, and Nigeria, at grade levels from two-to-twelve, and in diverse subjects including mathematics, language arts, writing, reading, social studies, and science. Positive effects have been found on such higher-order objectives as creative writing, reading comprehension, and math problem-solving, as well as on such basic skills objectives as language mechanics, math computations, and spelling. In general, achievement effects have been equal for high, average, and low achievers, for boys and girls, and for students of various ethnic backgrounds. As noted earlier, positive effects of cooperative learning have also been demonstrated on race relations, acceptance of mainstreamed academically handicapped classmates, student self-esteem, and enjoyment of class.

Comprehensive Cooperative Learning Methods

Since 1980, research and development on cooperative learning conducted at Johns Hopkins University has begun to focus on comprehensive cooperative learning methods designed to entirely replace traditional instruction in particular subjects and at particular grade levels. Two major programs of this type have been developed and successfully researched: Team Accelerated Instruction (TAI) in mathematics for grades 3-6, and Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC) in reading, writing, and language arts for

grades 3-5. The main elements of these programs afford the basis for cooperative learning's instructional foundation.

TAI shares with STAD and the other Student Team Learning methods the use of four-member mixed ability learning teams and certificates fo high-performing teams. But where STAD uses a single pace of instruction for the class, TAI combines cooperative learning with individualized instruction. TAI is designed to teach mathematics to students in grades 3-6 or provide instruction for older students not ready for a full algebra course.

In TAI, students take a placement test and then proceed at their own rates. In general, team members work on different units. Teammates check each others' work against answer sheets and help one another with any problems. Final unit tests are taken without teammate help and are scored by student monitors. Each week teachers total the number of units completed by all team members and give certificates or other rewards to teams which exceed a criterion score based on the number of final tests passed, with extra points for perfect papers and completed homework.

In TAI, students handle routine checking and management. This allows the teacher to spend most class time teaching small groups at the same level in the program. This direct instruction (lacking in other forms of individualization), plus the motivation and help provided by students within their cooperative teams, probably account for the strong positive effects of TAI on student achievement. Five of six studies found substantially greater learning of mathematics computations in TAI than in control classes, while one study found no differences. Across all six studies, the TAI classes gained an average of twice as many grade

equivalents on standardized mathematics computations measures as traditionally taught control classes.

CIRC is the newest of the Student Team Learning methods utilized for teaching reading and writing in the upper elementary grades. In CIRC, teachers use basal readers and reading groups, much as in traditionnal reading programs. Students are assigned, however, to teams composed of pairs of students from two different reading groups. While the teacher is working with one reading group, students in the other groups are working in their pairs on a series of cognitively engaging activities, including reading to one another, making predictions about how narrative stories will come out, summarizing stories to one another, writing responses to stories, and practicing spelling, decoding, and vocabulary. Students work in teams to master main ideas and other comprehension skills. During language arts periods, a structured program based on a writing process model is used. Students engage in planning and writing drafts, revising and editing one another's work, and preparing for publication of team books. Lessons on such writing skills as description, organization, and use of vivid modifiers and on language mechanics skills are fully integrated into students' creative writing.

In most CIRC activities, students follow a sequence of teacher instruction, team practice, team pre-assessments, and quizzes. Students do not take a quiz until their teammates have determined that they are ready. Certificates are given to teams based on the average performance of all team members on all reading and writing activities. Two studies of CIRC found substantial positive effects of this method on standardized tests of reading comprehension, reading vocabulary, language expression,

language mechanics, and spelling in comparison to control groups. The CIRC classes gained thirty to seventy percent of a grade equivalent more than control classes on these measures in both studies. Significantly greater achievement on writing samples favoring the CIRC students was also found in both studies.

The Cooperative School

The development and successful evaluation of the comprehensive TAI and CIRC models has created an exciting new possibility. With cooperative learning programs capable of being used all year in the 3 R's, it is now possible to design an elementary school program based upon the principle that students, teachers, and administrators can work together as a collective unit to make the school a better place for working and learning.

What might a cooperative elementary school look like? There are many visions of what a cooperative school might be, but there is one model that my colleagues and I have begun to work toward in partnership with some innovative practitioners. Its major components are as follows:

1. Cooperative Learning in the Classroom. Cooperative elementary schools have cooperative learning methods in use in most classrooms, and in more than one subject. Students and teachers believe that students can help one another learn not just an idea applied on occasion, but a fundamental principle of classroom organization. Students see one another as resources for learning, and there is a school-wide norm that every student's learning is everyone's responsibility, that every student's success is everyone's success.

2. Integration of Special Education and Remedial Services with the Regular Program. In the cooperative elementary school, mainstreaming is an essential element of school and classroom organization. Special education teachers may team-teach with regular instructors, integrating their students in teams with non-handicapped students and contributing their expertise in adapting instruction to individual needs and to the class as a whole. Similarly, Chapter I or other remedial services may be provided in the regular classroom. If we take seriously the idea that all students are responsible for one another, this goes as much for students with learning problems as for anyone else. Research on use of TAI and CIRC to facilitate mainstreaming and meet the needs of remedial readers has found positive effects on the achievement and social acceptance of these students.

3. Peer Coaching. In the cooperative elementary school, teachers are responsible for helping one another to use successfully cooperative learning methods and to implement other improvements in instructional practice. Peer coaching is perfectly adapted to the philosophy of the cooperative school. In peer coaching, teachers learn new methods together and are given release time to visit one another's classes to give assistance and exchange ideas as they begin using the new programs.

4. Cooperative Planning. Cooperative activities among teachers should not be restricted to peer coaching.

In addition, teachers should be given time to plan goals and strategies together, to prepare common libraries of instructional materials, and to make decisions about cooperative activities involving more than one class.

5. Building-Level Steering Committee. In the cooperative elementary school, a steering committee composed of the principal, teacher representatives, representatives of other staff (e.g., special education, Chapter I, aides), and one or more parent representatives meets to discuss the progress the school is making toward its instructional goals and to recommend changes in school policies and practices designed to achieve these goals.

6. Cooperation with Parents and Community Members. The cooperative school invites the participation of parents and of members of the community in which the school is located. Development of a community sense that children's success in school is everyone's responsibility is an important goal of the cooperative school.

To my knowledge, there is no school implementing all of the program elements listed here, but a few schools are moving in this direction. In Alexandria, Virginia, Mt. Vernon Community School is working with the National Education Association's "Mastery in Learning" project to build a cooperative school plan. At Mt. Vernon, a building steering committee is planning and helping to implement a gradual integration of the TAI math program and CIRC reading, writing, and language arts programs. Three

schools in Anne Aruade County, Maryland, are also working toward the cooperative school ideal. Several schools throughout the nation which successfully implemented TAI math are now planning to add CIRC for reading and writing instruction, and are looking toward full-scale implementation of a cooperative school plan.

In a time of limited resources for education, we must learn to make the best use of what we have. As the Reverend Jesse Jackson put it, the only one who can help us is us. Cooperative learning and the cooperative school provide the means to help students, teachers, and administrators work together and make meaningful improvements in the learning of all students.

A STRATEGY FOR RESTRUCTURING SCHOOLS: SCHOOL RENEWAL

Paul E. Heckman
College of Education
University of Arizona

The topic of this conference, "Restructuring the Schools," focuses our discussion; and it is this focus that causes me to raise a major concern that "restructuring" has become a strategy, and as such, it directs many of our projects and activities, which then become problematic for reasons which I shall explore in this paper. Because "restructuring" does not address changing the culture of schools nor the world views of those in the schools, I will propose an alternative strategy that centers on school renewal guided by reflection, inquiry, and a knowledge base consisting of ideas and beliefs about the nature of learning, learners, and the subject fields. Finally, I will provide evidence of the way a specific "Partnership" involved with the National Network for Educational Renewal has used this renewal strategy and what it has learned.

An examination of the reform period of the late 1950s and 60s brings to mind other calls for restructuring schools. Team teaching, non-grading, modular flexible scheduling, and individualized instruction dominated many earlier efforts to make schools different and more equitable places. These attempts aimed at changing the structure and the conditions of schooling, such as student/teacher ratios, age-graded classrooms, rigid schedules for each subject field, and large group teacher directed instruction. The real problem, however, lies beneath these problematic conditions. These problems have to do with the world views that teachers and others hold about the nature

of schooling. For example, attention to age-graded structures grows out of certain ideas about the nature of learners, including the beliefs that students are more alike than they are different at each age level and, during any one year age span, children need to learn the same things.

Changing these ideas becomes a vital focus of any reform effort because if these views about children do not change, schools will not. In order for schools to change, then, the strategy must shift to renewal. Renewal focuses on a number of critical changes that need to occur at a single school including: teachers describing together the present circumstances of what goes on in their school and classrooms; identifying the common conditions that exist across the classrooms of a school; understanding the common beliefs and ideas about the nature of learning, learners, and the subject fields that lie beneath these conditions; determining the problematic aspects of these practices, especially regarding the ways that they do or do not reflect existing knowledge about learners; and creating practices that reflect beliefs and ideas about the knowledge base and the context of these schools.

In effect, renewal encourages school educators to examine constantly how characteristic practices arise and to use knowledge from outside and inside the school about the nature of learning, learners, and subject fields. New practices and structures grow out of these ideas and will not automatically happen without renewal.

Several distinctions between restructuring and renewal strategies are important. First, a restructuring strategy usually appears to focus on specific school and/or classroom structures that have caught the attention of particular reformers. Once school people and/or policy makers agree that

there is a problem, they attempt to convince their constituencies that changing them is in the best interests of the schools, the children, and the society. Subsequent activities center on ways to adopt and implement proposed alternative structures to the ones suggested by those outside of the school. Consequently, the success of these efforts will be determined by the degree to which new structures are put in place.

Second, staff development workshops and/or small group meetings direct activities that help teachers embrace these new structures. An instance is when people from other schools who have tried out these particular alternative structures provide examples of how they implemented them and ways to handle the daily business of school. In effect, this strategy asks teachers to understand why the old structure no longer fits and why the new one does, and to implement and live with the new structure.

Finally, teachers remain largely passive to these structural changes. Although they can modify them in time, the emphasis is on putting into practice what other people have in mind for them to do. This strategy does not encourage active teacher problem solving and reconstruction of their world views that would create their own new structures.

With a strategy of renewal, however, the ground shifts away from implementing new structures, although new structures eventually replace old ones as a consequence of this strategy. First, every attempt is made to encourage teachers and others at school to discuss current practices and why they exist. This may sound unimportant, yet it is a pivotal point for this strategy. World views are the meanings that teachers have constructed about schooling practices and structures. In order to get at these ideas, the particular structures have to be understood. As a matter of fact, we do know

that teachers spend little time talking to one another about their common practices. They are isolated, and such a condition prevents examination of world views because common knowledge does not exist about what normally happens in classrooms. As long as the culture of the school, which is synonymous with world views, goes unexamined, it will change little.

Second, the creation and use of knowledge play an important part in this strategy. It should be clear that this knowledge goes far beyond particular techniques and structures. It also includes knowledge about the nature of learning and subject fields. Two shifts seem to demonstrate the difference apparent between these two knowledge bases. For many years teachers and others have defined learning as a perceived change in behavior. Consequently, many of the classroom practices that predominate in schools have their roots in this definition. For instance, seat work predominates which consists of practice exercises that eventually should help students learn because their behavior appears to change over time. That is, students gain proficiency in solving single-digit addition problems within a specified time; and when this happens, teachers infer that students have learned addition operations.

But what happens to our acceptance of that practice if the definition of learning changed. Cognitive psychologists now define learning as constructing meanings. This has implications for classroom practice because the focus shifts away from practice exercises to ways for learners to construct meaning about addition operations. Moreover, we now understand that activity and social interaction are key ingredients for constructing meaning. Students will not construct meaning if they sit alone and listen to the teacher's meanings. Instead, they must act on the material with others.

Finally, this strategy requires adequate support so that groups of teachers from a school can construct together new world views about schooling. In the past, we may have underestimated the support structures required for renewal and restructuring. "School-University Partnerships" and the "National Network for Educational Renewal" play a significant role in supporting renewal. Over time, we have developed some practices and ways to encourage it. The activities of The Southern Maine Partnership illustrate this point. Six Partnership groups meet outside the confines of any one school and district and attempt to support the norms suggested above. These meetings do not replace the school activities that also go on daily and monthly, but essentially, these groups promote renewal at the school level.

Superintendents from the eleven school districts meet regularly to support and encourage each other, to determine the overall directions of the Partnership, and to discuss educational issues that affect their daily activities. Some of these issues include ways to support curricula that reflect the best analysis and projections of what young people need; cultivate site-based staff development activities that foster continual school renewal; and restructure schools to assure increased continuity in students' programs and infuse knowledge relative to education in the schools.

A "Leadership Enhancement Group" also meets monthly. This includes principals, assistant principals, and central office people who concentrate on issues such as those addressed by the superintendents. Four groups of teachers and principals from these schools also meet monthly. These support groups address special problems that the members face at a particular level

of schooling or in a specific subject field of the curriculum. The members of the group identify a problem area at their first meeting and determine the agenda for the next meeting. One group, the "Early Childhood Group," examines problems and issues related to providing continuous learning experiences for young children five to eight years old. The members discuss their present circumstances, their underlying beliefs about them, and any relevant literature. After each meeting, they return to their school in order to test a topic discussed at the meeting and then go to the next meeting to relate what happened when they did this.

A second group focuses on issues and concerns of teachers and administrators in Grades 4 to 8. In particular, they challenge the prevailing instructional practices of teacher talk, seat work, and testing as the most appropriate learning environment for students in this developmental phase. Instead, they suggest ways to engage these learners while attending to their developmental characteristics. Of course, they know that the organizational characteristics of their schools will also have to change, but for now, they focus on their classroom and ways to take small steps.

The third group consists of high school teachers and administrators who initially examined prevailing grouping practices such as tracking; then they later moved to a position similar to the Middle School group. Thus, their exploration has directed them to an understanding of the ways schools represent knowledge that insures some students will succeed and others will fail. In order to overcome this problem, the members of this group have begun to explore alternative practices in light of new views of intelligence.

Finally, a group of teachers from across grade levels meets monthly to

explore the nature of mathematics teaching in schools. Discussions center on whether current teaching practices reflect what is now known about learning and mathematics and what alternative practices might reflect this knowledge.

Several lessons about supporting renewal and school restructuring have come from these experiences. First, a great deal of freedom has to be given in order for teachers and principals to examine and challenge existing practices, uncover underlying beliefs, and create new practices that reflect current knowledge. In particular, superintendents and principals give or take away permission to and/or from teachers and others for renewal. And teachers encourage or discourage renewal for one another. Moreover, freedom also works the other way. Teachers give permission to principals to consider other ways of performing as principals, and principals and teachers act towards superintendents in the same way.

Second, it takes time, probably five-to-ten years, to establish norms of renewal and affect school and classroom practices and structures. All of the interested parties need time to talk to one another and to experiment with new educational practices. Partnership members must see the long term prospects and not become impatient with the small but necessary steps that fundamental restructuring requires.

Third, a norm of "playfulness" must exist at each school and within the groups that encourage renewal. "Playfulness" is nothing more than entertaining alternative ideas and trying out practices that grow out of these. Of course, it means accepting the normal scientific perspective that when something does not work we have also learned something.

Fourth, each school and each Partnership succeeds to the degree that a

critical mass of teachers, principals, and/or superintendents adhere to alternative world views. A consensus forms when a few, perhaps only three or four, meet and, as they experience renewal, others join them. This mode contrasts with the typical staff development strategy of involving everyone at first. A focus on consensus encourages the creation of alternative norms and helps teachers and others reconstruct the meanings that they have about schooling practices and structures.

Finally, a need exists for an alternative leader, a person who raises questions and inserts into the discussion alternative ideas in a timely manner. To do this, however, the person must acquire the confidence and consent of the group. It is important to note that teachers do want to think, to have their practices challenged, and to create. They have not had much opportunity to do this so that in many cases they ask for answers/techniques and special structures because that is what they believe they should do. As they reflect on what they do, interact with colleagues, and an alternative leader, the quest for alternatives increases.

The experiences of the Southern Maine Partnership suggest that renewal will lead to restructuring in the long run and that it is an effective, intelligent process for restructuring the schools.

THE POTENTIAL OF TEACHER PROFESSIONALISM: CONDITIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Judy A. Johnston
Director
Schenley High School Teacher Center

The quality of secondary education has been the subject of considerable debate during the past half decade. This debate has tended to focus on three critical issues: the rigor of the curriculum, related standards for graduation, and the quality of teachers in our nations's high schools. The attention to secondary education and its attendant reform has had its strongest impact in the areas of curriculum and standards. Most states have already implemented revised curricula and have rewritten criteria for high school graduation, adding or increasing requirements in such areas as writing, mathematics, science, and computer literacy.

By contrast, the press for quality teaching has sparked much more debate than constructive action. Discussions about teachers have been divided by disagreement over the extent of the problems and by whether viable solutions should emphasize improving the pool of quality new entries to the field, or applying more rigorous accountability standards and evaluation processes for professionals presently in service. Perhaps what is most interesting here is that a new issue (and round of debate) has emerged during the past two years. This discussion focuses on "teacher professionalism" and its implications for educational reform.

The issue of professionalism stems in part from reaction to prior criticism. A number of the early national reports implicitly blamed

teachers for many of the problems besetting education, without showing much sympathy or even understanding of conditions that militate against quality education. The concern about professionalism is also deeply rooted in the conviction of some educational reformers and most teachers that serious improvement in education can be achieved only if teachers themselves take significant responsibility in crafting and implementing some of the needed reforms.

The Schenley High School Teacher Center (SHSTC) provides a rich context in which to examine the issue of teacher professionalism, the conditions which foster it and the implications of its development.

The Schenley High School Teacher Center

In 1981, two years before the publication of "A Nation at Risk," the Pittsburgh Board of Education identified secondary staff development as a central priority. This was followed by an 18-month planning period involving over 200 teachers, administrators, and central office personnel. The planning process was supported, in part, by a grant from the Ford Foundation.

What emerged from the planning process was a structure for housing a teacher center at a comprehensive high school (Schenley High School). To accomplish this, the school was "closed" on paper and reopened with faculty recruited from across the district. Over the course of Phase I of the program (1983-1987), plans called for virtually every secondary teacher to come to the SHSTC for a comprehensive staff development experience.

The Center is entering its fifth year of operation, and over 900 teachers have participated in the Center's program. Teachers come in groups of 48, for eight weeks at a time during the school year (four cycles per year). These

"visiting teachers" are replaced in their own home school classrooms by a cadre of trained and fully certified replacement teachers.

The details of the staff development experience are still emerging. Nevertheless, the essential goals have been and continue to be to: (a) refine and expand instructional skills; (b) increase sensitivity to adolescents and the culture of youth; (c) update knowledge in specific content areas; (d) disseminate knowledge about district-wide educational improvement initiatives; (e) provide opportunities for personal and professional enrichment; and (f) encourage the development of individualized follow-through plans for continued professional growth.

These fundamental goals were derived from the initial planning process and particularly a district-wide needs assessment which surveyed secondary teachers regarding their perceived needs and professional growth interests. In order to meet the goals of the Center, visiting teachers participate in a wide range of teacher-lead mini-course seminars, independent renewal activities, and systematic opportunities for teachers to visit a variety of sites and programs in the larger community called "externships."

A central element in the success of the Center's program is the role played by its "resident staff," whose responsibilities go well beyond the traditional functions of classroom teachers. The resident staff serves as the teachers of the over 1,000 students of the high school, albeit with reduced teaching schedules. In addition, they develop and teach seminars on a wide range of educational topics; their classrooms serve as models of good instruction; and they maintain the clinical program for visiting teachers. The 25 clinical resident teachers, a subset of the resident staff, are each assigned one or two visiting colleagues per cycle. With these

visiting teachers they plan instruction, observe that instruction, and confer about activities for which they received special training.

The development of these new roles, "teachers of teachers," "seminar leaders," or "peer coaches," which arise from the unique staff requirements of the Teacher Center, provide rich information concerning the conditions necessary, both organizationally and contextually, for the development of teacher professionalism.

Conditions

Three organizational conditions exist. The Center's initial design was marked by a sustained commitment to collaborative planning. Fully eighteen months before the Center opened its doors, the district initiated an elaborate planning process that directly involved over 200 secondary teachers and administrators in design and decision-making activities. The professionals who were the focus of the Center had key roles in shaping the Center.

A second condition was the district's clear commitment to innovation and flexibility. Planning and implementation proceeded with a strong sense that if the program was to be at all successful, the number of "givens" had to be reduced to a minimum, and the freedom to try new methods, structures, and resource utilization approaches must be expanded. Some of the specific program characteristics discussed later on in this section are direct manifestations of this commitment to innovation.

A third condition effectively implemented at Schenley can be thought of as a hybrid leadership model: strong centralized leadership on the part of the Superintendent and the School Board was combined with effective

operational leadership on-site by the Center's principal, director, and faculty. This approach to leadership had the effect of adding tangible support and influence to the Center's efforts, while enabling the program to grow and evolve in direct response to emerging problems and needs.

Four conditions foster the growth of teacher professionalism. The first of these is that the professional development effort is school-focused. The program recognizes that the most important interaction in any school district is that between a teacher and a student. The substance of the program, then, is comprised of content to enrich or improve that interaction. Moreover, this school focus also extends to the manner in which the program is organized and delivered. Most obviously, the program's activities take place not in any artificial environment, but rather in a fully operating comprehensive high school. Because of this, it offers the opportunity to practice all that is being learned, and to engage in self criticism and/or critical review of instruction with one's peers.

A second essential condition is that the staff development program takes place on company time. Approaching the staff development effort in this way ensures participation as well as both the quality and quantity of time that is available. By delivering its program during the school day, the Center ensures that the participants approach the program unwearied by having already performed a full day's professional activity and unfettered by the burdens and demands that normally occupy any conscientious professional.

A third essential condition may be thought of as attitudinal: it is the realization of a mutual obligation to staff development held to by the school district and its teachers. By providing this professional development

program as part of the normnal work scope for teachers and by supporting their participation in it, the district signals its obligation to provide for the ongoing development of its professionals. The teachers for their part recognize the responsibility of any professional to avail themselves of a reasonable opportunity to maintain their professional identities. Essential to the successful realization of this mutual obligation is that the program itself was negotiated and defined between the district's leadership and the teaching professionals who serve in the system.

A fourth and most important condition that is essential to any staff development effort in this and succeeding decades is that it be built from the inside, using teachers to implement and maintain the program and to deliver it to their peers. Two goals, at least, are served by developing the program in this way. First, it capitalizes on the power of peers working with peers to enhance instructional performance. It recognizes and genuinely supports the professionalism of the teachers to have them participate genuinely in both the definition and the maintenance of the program. Second, employing teachers in a variety of differentiated roles also varies the task load and responsibilities of teachers. It recognizes that a teaching professional might have one of a variety of very special competencies and encourages one to use that ability to serve the program as a scholar of subject matter, adolescent development, instructional innovation, educational research and literature, or pedagogy. This diversification of roles and responsibilities serve to promote a sense of well-being in the profession that may encourage some of the best teachers to grow, be recognized, and appreciated, while continuing to serve as teachers in the classroom.

Implications

The implications of developing and implementing a very rich staff development program with teachers sharing in the decision-making process, in fact structuring the experience, yield a series of significant issues which those concerned with teacher professionalism should address.

The roles at the Schenley High School Teacher Center, designed and filled by teachers, demonstrate that teachers can contribute in significant ways to the professional development of their peers while still remaining in the classroom. Further, these roles demonstrate the level of professional skill and commitment that can be tapped within the teaching force without losing the force and power of good teachers in the process.

A second implication inherent in the above is the extent to which the shaping of the various Teacher Center roles was engineered by the teachers who would fill them. Each role continues to evolve. Nationally, where new roles are mandated by outside sources, the same opportunity for the self-determination of the role may be limited. This, in turn, may diminish professional commitment and ultimately the reward envisioned. Those who would mandate new roles are well advised to remember that teachers, if given the opportunity, can envision, create, develop a variety of appropriate, professionally rewarding roles.

Based on the Teacher Center experience, a third implication is only now becoming clear: what was once new can become old, and what was once an extremely important and exhilarating professional challenge can become draining and stressful over time. Professional teachers crafting new roles must be careful to not underestimate the difficulties; systems in which these teachers function must build support mechanisms into professionalism models.

Last, and perhaps most significantly, teacher professionalism and its concomitant effects demand new roles, attitudes and treatment from other professionals. Teachers who have shared in the decision-making process, have designed and filled new and professionally-rewarding roles, have taken responsibility for their own and their peer's professional development cannot be treated in Albert Shanker's words as "hired hands" by those who facilitate or supervise their work. Business as usual will not suffice.

RESTRUCTURING SCHOOLS TO FACILITATE TEACHER LEARNING

Willis D. Hawley
Dean, Peabody College
Vanderbilt University

The fundamental purpose of schools is to foster children's learning and in reforming our schools we have properly focused on this goal. Why, then, should there be concern about structuring schools to facilitate teacher learning?

1. Effective teachers are essential to effective student learning. The quality of teaching is the variable we can most influence that has the largest effect on student learning.
2. What teachers do depends on their innate capacities as these are modified by what teachers learn to do and to value.
   a. We have associated teachers' learning with institution-based teacher education or formal inservice training, but there is reason to believe that the effects of such education is limited.
   b. In contrast, teachers say that they learn from experience and from their peers. It is not hard to understand that lessons experienced on the job--which are reinforced in much more powerful ways than learning in universities or in conventional inservice programs--would be assimilated effectively. The bad news is that some of us do not learn much new from our experiences, especially if the implications are that we should change our behavior.

c. Most of the lessons about teaching one can learn from universities, texts, television, or inservice offered by states or local district offices are contingent on local conditions, even on differences in classrooms within a particular school. Thus, systematic learning in the context of the school is likely to be more relevant and immediately useful than other kinds of professional learning.

d. The primary reason to facilitate teacher learning is to improve teacher performance. But because teacher performance occurs in the context of a social system, a teacher's capacity and motivation to learn will be shaped by work-setting norms and, more specifically, the willingness and capacity of the system to change.

e. A teacher's world is full of learning opportunities most of which could tell the teacher something about the efficacy of what he or she is doing to influence student learning, but most of these messages are not received. But we do know the opportunity to learn to be better at what one does is a source of motivation and job satisfaction. A general finding of research in business organizations and schools emphasizes the same point.

Structuring Schools to Facilitate Teaching Learning

If it is so important to design schools and practices within them to facilitate teacher learning, what would a school that valued this goal look like? A school for teacher learning would be characterized by five conditions that would have the following characteristics:

Condition 1: Provide Information Relevant to Differences Between Goals of the School and Each Individual Teacher:

This is the hardest condition to achieve because it involves organizational structures and poses a potential threat to individual and group self-esteem. The condition requires:

a. Mechanisms for formulating and clarifying goals, and the priorities attached to different goals.

b. Organizational and individual strategies for gathering data on goal attainment. These include:

- Team teaching
- Time to engage in observation of peers
- Training to collect, provide and receive data
- Student response to instruction as evaluated by teachers
- Student achievement data on tests (standard but not necessarily standardized)

c. A capacity to analyze data and draw inferences from them. This involves the development of skills related to systematic inquiry and problem solving. Teachers who understand the theory or theories that underlie the particular teaching strategy being considered will be better problem solvers.

d. Protections for the school and individual from hostile external response to the identified need for teacher learning.

Condition 2: Provide Sources of Teacher Learning Relevant to Identified Learning Needs:

a. Peers

b. Universities and colleges

c. Students

d. Parents

e. Professional journals and texts used

f. Curriculum support materials

g. Teacher centers

h. Consultants

i. Simulations

j. Professional conferences, workshops (the content of which is reported)

k. Collaborative research

Condition 3: Ensure Access to Learning:

a. Time to learn

b. People should be assigned to the task of helping teachers gain access to learning sources. Such teachers would be freed from regular duties to allow them time to learn. Other persons involved would be lead teachers, school administrators, central staff personnel, and, perhaps, teaching interns.

c. "Catalogs" of learning resources should be available, including electronic bulletin boards.

Condition 4: Provide Resources to Implement What is Learned:

Learning that cannot be implemented will be unlearned or worse. When one cannot address a recognized need to learn, one either discounts the need or feels frustrated and alienated. Thus, the facilitation of learning requires the facilitation of change. Some resources for the implementation of learning can come from:

a. Mini-grants.

b. The mobilization of peer support, a role that lead teachers or principals should be prepared to play.

c. Access to consultation from experts.

d. Principals who see scavenging as a noble endeavor.

e. The authority to reallocate resources within the school, but this must be done as consensually as possible.

f. Teacher resource centers.

Condition 5: Teacher Learning Needs to be Rewarded:

a. Feedback on student learning.

b. Opportunities for professional development.

c. Opportunities for leadership.

d. Recognition individuals and groups.

e. The potential of group incentives for improvements.

Schools that Facilitate Teacher Learning

What would such a school look like? Teachers would be able to clearly identify their goals and those of the school, and priorities assigned to particular goals. The primary role of teacher educators and principals would

be to assist teachers to learn. Almost all inservice teacher experience would take place in the school, except when those involved were acting as agents for others. Teacher learning would be seen as integral to all aspects of the school program.

If we visited such a school, we would see and hear:

- More teacher interaction, both in teaching roles and outside the classroom.
- A large room where teachers' desks were grouped together in a common space for teacher planning and out-of-class work.
- Resource rooms for subjects and grades, depending on school size.
- School libraries stocked with materials, including computer software, for teachers and students.
- The telling of stories about things teachers had done that caused students to learn and the school to be supported.
- District level administrators who were there to meet the needs of teachers as teachers define them. These people would be working at the school level most of the time.
- Teachers who were proud of the special competence they had that allowed them to do something no one else could do.

The quality of the teacher in an outstanding school can never exceed

the quality of student performance and character. This is why making teachers more effective remains one of the highest priorities of educational reform. Teachers can learn their craft within schools that are designed to instruct both students and teachers at the same time. The school affording teacher learning would integrate the most current goals of education with new principles of teacher education.

SUMMATION

Sol Hurwitz
Senior Vice President
Committee for Economic Development

This summation is not only a rendering of the highlights of this conference but also a personal report. It therefore deals with some issues that were either omitted entirely from the discussions or, in my view, not adequately covered.

Our topic was "Restructuring the Schools," so my report draws frequently on the analogy of architecture. Surely, the architects of this meeting, Richard M. Bossone and Fred H. Hechinger, deserve high praise. The meeting had a coherent design: it established a solid foundation with broadly-based presentations that accented the major themes; it then exposed the compartments and details of the design through individual and diverse perspectives.

Fred Hechinger opened with the key question: "How will our proposals affect children?" Frank Newman made the cogent plea, often ignored in policy discussions, "Start with the child." In the opening address, Owen B. Butler emphasized that the greatest source of productivity is people, but he made clear that education for employment is not enough. Education is the vehicle by which individuals make wise choices in a democratic system. Ernest Boyer later echoed this theme with the view that we should be "educating for civic literacy not private quest."

Relating lessons from the business world, Mr. Butler likened today's

education system to the "batch process" of manufacturing which starts with a homogeneous raw material that undergoes stages of change and emerges as a finished product. "We have changed the assignment of public education," which according to Mr. Butler is to educate a large and diverse population, "but we haven't changed the system." We need to restructure the system to education for heterogeneity, Mr. Butler contended. He cited examples of school operations--transportation, real estate, food services--to which business could apply management expertise. But the most vital function of business, Mr. Butler argued, is advocacy for the public schools, and particularly for higher school taxes.

Representing the host state, Governor Ned McWherter's opening remarks identified education as Tennessee's "number one priority." Charles E. Smith, Tennessee Commissioner of Education, emphasized the educational gains that had been made in the state and pledged to carry forward the reform program of former Governor Lamar Alexander.

Michael Cohen's agenda for the 90s focused on curriculum, uses of time, rates of learning, staffing, school settings, assessment strategies, and accountability. Diane Berreth called for restructuring curriculum content and organization in a way that would include cooperative learning as a goal. She stressed the importance of the role of a school's "hidden curriculum"--the messages it consciously or unconsciously sends students concerning cooperation, punctuality, and hard work.

The conference's education reform agenda included numerous suggestions for changes in time and space. The length of the school period, school day, and school year came under scrutiny, to be sure, but larger questions were also asked: When does education begin? When does it end? Owen Butler,

reflecting the view of the Committee for Economic Development's report, Children in Need: Investment Strategies for the Educationally Disadvantaged, 1987, argued that education begins "at conception" with prenatal care and continues from birth through the various stages of child development. In fact, he urged that we "rid ourselves of the traditional notion of 'education' and think of 'child development' instead." Concern raised by several speakers over adult illiteracy indicated that education never ends.

Offering a graphic description of "the boxes we call our schools," Ernest Boyer issued a harsh indictment of the enormous size, shoddy state of repair, and "faceless and nameless" atmosphere that characterizes urban schools. He called for breaking up today's large urban schools into "small academic villages."

Some speakers described a structure for the schools that reaches beyond conventional boundaries into the home, the family, and the community. Others saw the traditional school setting as the locus of reform.

Leon M. Goldstein maintained that the solution to poverty, poor health, housing, and unemployment must come from the community, "not the schools." The schools, he said, "cannot substitute for a mother and father, a table and light, a book and a writing instrument." Similarly, Frank Newman related the story of Evelyn Beasley, a Baltimore school principal, who reached into the homes of her students to bring parents into the schools. Willie Herenton and Arthur Jefferson described a series of dropout prevention strategies in Memphis and Detroit respectively which involved close collaboration among schools, businesses, and the community. Willie Herenton urged that "we visit the housing projects and talk

personally to the people who are most affected." Arthur Jefferson said we need to be "willing to openly engage the entire community" in dropout prevention efforts.

Robert Slavin identified the schools as the primary unit of change and the classroom as the center of reform. He claimed success for cooperative education in improving student achievement. Paul Heckman, contending that the dominant mode of teaching has not changed very much, called for renewal in the teaching and learning process through a partnership involving superintendents, teachers, and principals who can learn from each other.

A dominant theme in the conference discussion was the overriding importance of teachers in school restructuring. "If you're concerned about the child," asserted Willis Hawley, "be concerned about the teacher" and create schools in which teachers can learn. Judy Johnston argued that the best restructuring enhances the interaction of the student and the teacher in the classroom. She described the professional development programs of Pittsburgh's Schenley Teacher Center, in which teachers work with teachers "on company time, in quality time" to improve teaching. She called for a decision-making role for teachers in every step of the reform process and urged that we get rid of hierarchical notions of education that regard teachers as "hired hands." Holly Houston talked about a collaborative process in which teachers assume more leadership than in the past and play a vital role in goal setting and problem solving for the Brown University directed "Coalition of Essential Schools."

In response to a question on the role of teacher unions in school reform, Michael Cohen urged that unions, school boards, and the school administration try to resolve their differences through mutual trust "away

from the collective bargaining table." He said he believed that trust was the key to the close working relationships among teachers, superintendents, and school boards in three school districts where important school improvements are being made: Rochester, New York; Miami-Dade; and Charlotte-Mecklenberg.

The day and a half of dialogue was considerably enriched by the presence in the audience of people with classroom teaching experience. During the conference, for example, a teacher cited the multiple and often conflicting demands placed on classroom teachers as a result of recent reforms.

An issue surrounding all of the discussions was financing. Yet a surprising number of speakers described new programs that would require "no additional resources," and Owen Butler's plea for business advocacy on behalf of additional funding for public education was not strongly reinforced in subsequent presentations and discussions. The views of the Committee for Economic Development in the report Children in Need are instructive on this issue. The study states (page 4): "Effecting . . . longer-term reforms will take a sustained effort and a firm commitment over the years by a broad-based coalition of government, education, business, and community leaders. And it will require more money. Any plan for major improvements in the developmenmt and education of disadvantaged children that does not recognize the need for additional resources over a sustained period is doomed to failure."

The rationale for this position is clear. Business has increasingly come to regard education as an investment, not an expense, and it is an investment that pays large dividends in the future. A one dollar investment

in a quality preschool program, for example, returns $4.75 to taxpayers because of lower costs of special education, public assistance, and crime.

Finally, several speakers referred to the various "waves" in the present education reform movement. Clearly, the first wave of reform, following the publication in April, 1983, of A Nation At Risk, was a call for tougher standards and tighter requirements, longer school days and years, more homework. It was a movement in which the governors and state legislators were the principal players, and it imposed on school systems substantial regulations, prescriptions, and controls.

The second wave centered on teachers and the management of the schools, and it called for a "bottom-up" rather than a "top-down" approach to school improvement, with the teachers in a more important decision-making role. Proposals for improving the recruitment, training, motivation, and compensation of teachers characterized this second wave, along with recommendations for upgrading the status of the teaching profession and the conditions of work, and granting teachers more autonomy and control over their lives in the classroom.

Currently we are entering a third wave of school reform which calls on the nation to give highest priority to the plight of disadvantaged children. The strategy for dealing with children in need involves early and sustained intervention and a restructuring of education along the lines proposed by the conference participants--through prenatal care and early childhood education and development, and targeted programs for students at risk and dropouts, which involve an array of school and community services preferably available on the school site.

There was little disagreement on priorities in the course of this

conference. The largest barrier, in my view, is the fragmentation of decision-making at every level of government. How can we reconcile federal and state goals in education with those of the local school district? And how do we involve the multiplicity of government agencies--in education, health and human services, economic development, and the criminal justice system--in a coherent solution?

My hope is that a fourth wave of reform will take place in the political arena where the clash of interests can be resolved in a way that answers the question Fred Hechinger posed at the opening: How will it affect the children?